arXiv:1609.03904v1 [math.AG] 13 Sep 2016

Polynomial Hessians with small rank

Michiel de Bondt*

September 14, 2016

Abstract

In this paper, which is work in progress, the results in [Singular Hessians, J. Algebra 282 (2004), no. 1, 195–204], for polynomial Hessians with determinant zero in small dimensions $r+1$, are generalized to similar results in arbitrary dimension, for polynomial Hessians with rank r. All of this is over a field K of characteristic zero. The results in [Singular Hessians, J. Algebra 282 (2004), no. 1, 195–204] are also reproved in a different perspective.

One of these results is the classification by Gordan and Noether of homogeneous polynomials in 5 variables, for which the Hessians determinant is zero. This result is generalized to homogeneous polynomials in general, for which the Hessian rank is 4. Up to a linear transformation, such a polynomial is either contained in $K[x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4]$, or contained in

$$K[x_1, x_2, p_3(x_1, x_2)x_3 + p_4(x_1, x_2)x_4 + \cdots + p_n(x_1, x_2)x_n]$$

for certain $p_3, p_4, \ldots, p_n \in K[x_1, x_2]$ which are homogeneous of the same degree.

Furthermore, a new result which is similar to those in [Singular Hessians, J. Algebra 282 (2004), no. 1, 195–204], is added, namely about polynomials $h \in K[x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4, x_5]$, for which the last four rows of the Hessian matrix of th are dependent. Here, t is a variable, which is not one of those with respect to which the Hessian is taken. This result is generalized to arbitrary dimension as well: the Hessian rank of th is 4 and the last row of the Hessian matrix of th is independent of the other rows.

1 Introduction

Let K be an arbitrary field and let L be an arbitrary extension field of K.

Write $x = (x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n)$, $X = (x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_N)$, $y = (y_1, y_2, \ldots, y_m)$ and $Y = (y_1, y_2, \ldots, y_M)$.

*The author's Ph.D. project was supported by The Netherlands Organization for Scientific Research (NWO).

2 dB-pairing

Inspired by the concept of 'GZ-pairing', which is defined as 'pairing' in [GZ], we define our own 'pairing'.

Definition 2.1. Assume that $1 \leq n \leq N$ and $1 \leq m \leq M$. Let $h \in L[x]^m$ and $H \in L[X]^M$. We say that h and H are *dB-paired over* K through matrices $B \in \mathrm{Mat}_{m,M}(L)$ and $C \in \mathrm{Mat}_{N,n}(L)$, if

(i) $h = B(H(Cx))$,

(ii) $\mathrm{trdeg}_K\, K(h) = \mathrm{trdeg}_K\, K(H)$.

If additionally

(iii) $B = C^{\mathrm{t}}$

then we say that h and H are *symmetrically dB-paired over* K through B and C. We say that h and H are (symmetrically) dB-paired over K if there exists matrices B and C as indicated above.

Proposition 2.2. *Suppose that $h \in L[x]^m$ and $H \in L[X]^M$ are dB-paired over K through matrices $B \in Mat_{m,M}(L)$ and $C \in \mathrm{Mat}_{N,n}(L)$. Then*

$$\mathrm{trdeg}_K\, K(h) = \mathrm{trdeg}_K\, K(BH) = \mathrm{trdeg}_K\, K(H) \tag{2.1}$$

Furthermore, $f(h) = 0 \iff f(BH) = 0$ for every $f \in K[y]$.

Proof. Since $\mathrm{trdeg}_K\, K(h) \leq \mathrm{trdeg}_K\, K(BH) \leq \mathrm{trdeg}_K\, K(H)$, we see that (2.1) follows from property (ii) of dB-pairing.

Let $\mathfrak{p} := \big(f \in K[y] \,\big|\, f(h) = 0\big)$ and $\mathfrak{q} := \big(f \in K[y] \,\big|\, f(BH) = 0\big)$. Then $K[h] \equiv K[y]/\mathfrak{p}$ and $K[BH] \equiv K[y]/\mathfrak{q}$. From property (i) of dB-pairing, we can deduce that $\mathfrak{p} \supseteq \mathfrak{q}$ and that it suffices to show that $\mathfrak{p} \supsetneq \mathfrak{q}$ does not hold. This follows from (2.1). □

Lemma 2.3. *Let $H \in L[X]^s$, such that $H_1, H_2, \ldots, H_s, x_{s+1}, x_{s+2}, \ldots, x_N$ is a transcendence basis over L of $L[X]$. Then there exists a nonzero polynomial $g \in L[x]$ such that*

$$g(H, x_{s+1}, x_{s+2}, \ldots, x_{N-1}, cx_{N-1}) \neq 0$$

implies that

$$H_1|_{x_N = cx_{N-1}}, H_2|_{x_N = cx_{N-1}}, \ldots, H_s|_{x_N = cx_{N-1}}, x_{s+1}, x_{s+2}, \ldots, x_{N-1}$$

is a transcendence basis over L of $L(x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_{N-1})$.

Proof. Take $i \leq s$. Then x_i is algebraically dependent over L of $H_1, H_2, \ldots, H_s$, $x_{s+1}, x_{s+2}, \ldots, x_N$, say that $f \in L[X, t]$ such that $f_i(H, x_{s+1}, x_{s+2}, \ldots, x_N, x_i) = 0$ and $f_i(H, x_{s+1}, x_{s+2}, \ldots, x_N, t) \neq 0$. Take $g_i \in L[X]$ such that $g_i(H, x_{s+1},$

$x_{s+2}, \ldots, x_N)$ is any nonzero coefficient of $f_i(H, x_{s+1}, x_{s+2}, \ldots, x_N, t)$ as a polynomial in t over $K[x]$.

Suppose that $g_i(H, x_{s+1}, x_{s+2}, \ldots, x_{N-1}, cx_{N-1}) \neq 0$. Then

$$f_i(H|_{x_N=cx_{N-1}}, x_{s+1}, x_{s+2}, \ldots, x_{N-1}, cx_{N-1}, x_i) = 0$$

and

$$f_i(H|_{x_N=cx_{N-1}}, x_{s+1}, x_{s+2}, \ldots, x_{N-1}, cx_{N-1}, t) \neq 0$$

So x_i is algebraically dependent over L of

$$\mathcal{B} := H_1|_{x_N=cx_{N-1}}, H_2|_{x_N=cx_{N-1}}, \ldots, H_s|_{x_N=cx_{N-1}}, x_{s+1}, x_{s+2}, \ldots, x_{N-1}$$

Put $g := g_1 g_2 \cdots g_s$ and suppose that $g(H, x_{s+1}, x_{s+2}, \ldots, x_{N-1}, cx_{N-1}) \neq 0$. From the above paragraph, we deduce that x_i is algebraically dependent over L of $\mathcal{B}$ for all $i \leq s$. Hence $\mathcal{B}$ is a transcendence basis over L of $L(x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_{N-1})$. □

Theorem 2.4. *Assume that K is infinite, and let $H \in L[X]^m$. Suppose that $n \leq N$, such that $x_n, x_{n+1}, \ldots, x_N$ are algebraically independent over $L(H)$. Then there exists a $C \in \mathrm{Mat}_{N,n}(K)$ of the form*

$$C^{\mathrm{t}} = \begin{pmatrix} & & & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ & I_{n-1} & & \vdots & \cdots & \vdots \\ & & & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & \cdots & 0 & c_n & \cdots & c_N \end{pmatrix} \qquad \text{where } c_n \cdots c_N \neq 0 \tag{2.2}$$

such that $H(CX)$ and H are dB-paired.

Proof. Let $s := \mathrm{trdeg}_K K(H)$ and assume without loss of generality that x_{s+1}, $x_{s+2}, \ldots, x_N$ is a transcendence basis over $K(H)$ of $K(X)$. Assume without loss of generality that $H_1, H_2, \ldots, H_s, x_{s+1}, x_{s+2}, \ldots, x_N$ is a transcendence basis over K of $K(X)$.

We may assume that $n = N - 1$, because the general case follows by induction. But in order to have the properties of H of this theorem in the induced situation, we must show that $H_1(CX), H_2(CX), \ldots, H_s(CX), x_{s+1}, x_{s+2}, \ldots, x_n$ is a transcendence basis over K of $K(x)$.

Take g as in lemma 2.3. There are only finitely many $c \in K$ such that $g(H, x_{s+1}, x_{s+2}, \ldots, x_{N-1}, cx_{N-1}) = 0$. Since K is infinite, there exists a $c \in K$ such that $g(H, x_{s+1}, x_{s+2}, \ldots, x_{N-2}, x_{N-1}, cx_{N-1}) \neq 0$. From lemma 2.3, it follows that $H_1|_{x_N=cx_{N-1}}, H_2|_{x_N=cx_{N-1}}, \ldots, H_s|_{x_N=cx_{N-1}}, x_{s+1}, x_{s+2}, \ldots, x_{N-1}$ is a transcendence basis over K of $K(x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_{N-1})$. So the induction is effective and $\mathrm{trdeg}_K K(H_1|_{x_N=cx_{N-1}}, H_2|_{x_N=cx_{N-1}}, \ldots, H_s|_{x_N=cx_{N-1}}) = s = \mathrm{trdeg}_K K(H_1|_{x_N=x_N+cx_{N-1}}, H_2|_{x_N=x_N+cx_{N-1}}, \ldots, H_s|_{x_N=x_N+cx_{N-1}})$. □

Corollary 2.5. *Assume that K is infinite, and let $H \in K[X]^N$. Suppose that $n \leq N$, such that $x_n, x_{n+1}, \ldots, x_N$ are algebraically independent over $K(H)$. Suppose additionally that H_i is algebraically dependent over K of $H_1, H_2, \ldots, H_{n-1}$ for all i. Then there exists a $C \in \mathrm{Mat}_{N,n}(K)$ of the form of (2.2), such that $C^{\mathrm{t}}H(CX)$ and H are symmetrically dB-paired.*

Proof. Let $h = (H_1, H_2, \ldots, H_{n-1})$. From theorem 2.4, it follows that there exists a $C \in \mathrm{Mat}_{N,n}(K)$ of the form of (2.2), such that $h(CX)$ and h are dB-paired. Furthermore, e_i is in the column space of C^{t} for each $i \leq n-1$, so $\mathrm{trdeg}_K\, K(h) = \mathrm{trdeg}_K\, K\big(h(CX)\big) \leq \mathrm{trdeg}_K\, K\big(C^{\mathrm{t}}H(CX)\big) \leq \mathrm{trdeg}_K\, K(H)$. Since $\mathrm{trdeg}_K\, K(h) = \mathrm{trdeg}_K\, K(H)$, we deduce that $C^{\mathrm{t}}H(CX)$ and H are dB-paired. □

Theorem 2.6. *Assume that K has characteristic zero, and let $h \in K[X]$. Suppose that $n \leq N$, such that the first $n-1$ rows of $\mathcal{H}h$ generate the row space of $\mathcal{H}h$ over $K(X)$. Then there exists a $C \in \mathrm{Mat}_{N,n}(K)$ of the form of (2.2), such that $C^{\mathrm{t}}(\nabla h)(CX)$ and ∇h are symmetrically dB-paired.*

Proof. From proposition 1.2.9 of either [vdE] or [dB1], it follows that H_i is algebraically dependent over K of $H_1, H_2, \ldots, H_{n-1}$ for all i. Since ∇h is symmetric, the first $n-1$ columns of $\mathcal{H}h$ generate the column space of $\mathcal{H}h$. Hence $e_n^{\mathrm{t}}, e_{n+1}^{\mathrm{t}}, \ldots, e_N^{\mathrm{t}}$ are independent over $K(x)$ of the rows of $\mathcal{H}h$. From proposition 1.2.9 of either [vdE] or [dB1], it follows that $x_n, x_{n+1}, \ldots, x_N$ are algebraically independent over $K(H)$. So the result follows from corollary 2.5. □

3 (Projective) image apices

Let X be an algebraic subset of K^m. We say that $a \in L^m$ is an *apex* of X if $(1-\lambda)c + \lambda a \in X$ for all $\lambda \in K$ and all $c \in X$. If we think of a as a point of the projective horizon, i.e. $\|a\| = \infty$, then we can denote the direction of a by p to get something that is properly defined.

We say that a $p \in L^m$ is a *projective apex* of X if $p \neq 0$ and $c + \lambda p \in X$ for all $\lambda \in K$ and all $c \in X$. We say that X has an *apex at infinity* if X has a projective apex. Indeed, if $\|a\| = \infty$ and p is the direction of a, then the meaning of that p is a projective apex of X is just essentially that the point a at infinity is an apex of X.



If X is the Zariski closure of a polynomial map H over an infinite field K, then we say that a and p as above are an *image apex* of H and a *projective image apex* of H respectively. For the case where L is not necessarily infinite, we use the definition below.

Suppose that $H \in L[x]^m$. We say that $a \in L^m$ is an *image apex of H (over K)* if

$$f(H) = 0 \Longrightarrow f\big((1-t)H + ta\big) = 0$$

for all $f \in L[y] (f \in K[y])$. We say that $p \in L^m$ is a *projective image apex of H (over K)* if $p \neq 0$ and

$$f(H) = 0 \Longrightarrow f\big(H + tp\big) = 0$$

for all $f \in L[y]$ ($f \in K[y]$). We say that H has an *image apex at infinity (over K)* if H has a projective image apex (over K).

Proposition 3.1. *Let H be a polynomial map to L^n, $B \in \mathrm{Mat}_{m,n}(K)$, and $c \in K^m$.*

(i) *If $a \in L^m$ is an image apex of H over K, then $Ba + c$ is an image apex of $BH + c$ over K.*

(ii) *If $p \in L^m$ is a projective image apex of H over K, then Bp is a projective image apex of $BH + c$ over K.*

Proof. Take $f \in K[y]$ arbitrary.

(i) Assume that $a \in L^m$ is an image apex of H over K. Suppose that $f(BH + c) = 0$. Since a is an image apex of H over K, $f(B((1-t)H + ta) + c) = 0$. By linearity of B, $f((1-t)BH + tBa + c) = 0$. Hence $f((1-t)(BH + c) + t(Ba + c)) = 0$ indeed.

(ii) Assume that $p \in L^m$ is a projective image apex of H over K. Suppose that $f(BH + c) = 0$. Since p is a projective image apex of H over K, $f(B(H + tp) + c) = 0$. By linearity of B, $f(BH + tBp + c) = 0$. Hence $f((BH + c) + tBp) = 0$ indeed. □

Proposition 3.2. *Let H be a polynomial map to L^m.*

(i) *$a \in L^m$ is an image apex of H over K, if and only if*

$$\mathrm{trdeg}_K\, K\big((1-t)H + ta\big) = \mathrm{trdeg}_K\, K\big(H\big)$$

if and only if t is algebraically independent over K of $(1-t)H + ta$.

(ii) *$p \in L^m$ is a projective image apex of H over K, if and only if*

$$\mathrm{trdeg}_K\, K\big(H + tp\big) = \mathrm{trdeg}_K\, K\big(H\big)$$

if and only if t is algebraically independent over K of $H + tp$.

Proof. We only prove (i), since (ii) is similar. Notice that

$$\mathrm{trdeg}_K\, K\big((1-t)H + ta, t\big) = \mathrm{trdeg}_K\, K\big(H, t\big) = \mathrm{trdeg}_K\, K\big(H\big) + 1$$

So t is algebraically independent over K of $(1-t)H+ta$, if and only if $\mathrm{trdeg}_K K\big((1-t)H+ta\big) = \mathrm{trdeg}_K K\big(H\big)$.

Since $f(H)=0 \Longleftarrow f((1-t)H+ta)=0$ follows by substituting $t=0$, we deduce that $\mathrm{trdeg}_K K\big((1-t)H+ta\big) = \mathrm{trdeg}_K K\big(H\big)$, if and only if $f(H)=0 \Longleftrightarrow f((1-t)H+ta)=0$ for all $f\in k[y]$, i.e. a is an image apex of H over K. □

Proposition 3.3. *Suppose that $H, H' \in L[x]^m$, such that $f(H)=0 \Longleftrightarrow f(H')=0$ for every $f\in K[y]$. If $q\in K^m$, then q is a (projective) image apex of H over K, if and only if q is a (projective) image apex of H' over K.*

Proof. We only prove the case where q is an image apex of H over K, since the other case is similar. Suppose that $q\in K^m$ is an image apex of H over K. Take $f\in K[y]$ such that $f(H)=0$. Then $f\big((1-t)H+tq\big)=0$. Hence for each i, $g_i(H)=0$, where g_i is the coefficient of t^i in $f\big((1-t)y+tq\big)\in K[y][t]$. By assumption, $g_i(H')=0$ for every i as well. So $f\big((1-t)H'+tq\big)=0$. □

Lemma 3.4. *Let $H\in L[x]^m$ and $f\in K[y]$. Then for the following statements:*

(1) $f\big((1-p_{m+1}t)H+tp\big)=0$ *and*

$$g(H)=0 \Longrightarrow g\big((1-q_{m+1}u)H+uq\big)=0$$

for every $g\in K(p)(y)$;

(2) $f\big((1-p_{m+1}t)\big((1-q_{m+1}u)H+uq\big)+tp\big)=0$;

(3) $f\big((1-p_{m+1}t-q_{m+1}u)H+tp+uq\big)=0$;

(4) $f\big((1-q_{m+1}u)\big((1-p_{m+1}t)H+tp\big)+uq\big)=0$;

we have (1) ⇒ (2) ⇔ (3) ⇔ (4).

Proof. Notice that (3) is symmetric in some sense and that (2) and (4) are reflections of each other in the same sense. Hence (3) ⇔ (4) follows in a similar manner as (2) ⇔ (3). So the following implications remain to be proved.

(1) ⇒ (2) Assume (1). Then $g_i(H)=0$, where g_i is the coefficient of t^i of $f\big((1-p_{m+1}t)y+tp\big)=0$. By assumption, $g_i\big((1-q_{m+1}u)H+uq\big)=0$ for each i as well, which gives (2).

(2) ⇒ (3) Assume (2). Then

$$f\big((1-p_{m+1}t)H-(1-p_{m+1}t)q_{m+1}uH+(1-p_{m+1}t)uq+tp\big)=0$$

and (3) follows by substituting $u=u/(1-p_{m+1}t)$.

(3) ⇒ (2) This is the converse of (2) ⇒ (3), so u is to be substituted by $u\cdot(1-p_{m+1}t)$. □

Corollary 3.5. *Let $H\in L[x]^m$ and $q\in L^m$. Then the following holds.*

(i) *For every $a \in L^m$, a is an image apex of $(1-t)H + ta$ over L.*

(ii) *For every $p \in L^m$, p is a projective image apex of $H + tp$ over L.*

(iii) *Suppose that $a \in K^m$. If q is a (projective) image apex of H over K, then q is a (projective) image apex of $(1-t)H + ta$ over K. The converse holds if a is an image apex of H over K.*

(iv) *Suppose that $p \in K^m$. If q is a (projective) image apex of H over K, then q is a (projective) image apex of $H + tp$ over K. The converse holds if p is a projective image apex of H over K.*

Proof. If we substitute t by $t+u$, then (i) and (ii) follow from (3) $\Rightarrow$ (4) of lemma 3.4, where we take $(p, p_{m+1}) = (q, q_{m+1}) = (a, 1)$ and $(p, p_{m+1}) = (q, q_{m+1}) = (p, 0)$ respectively.

The forward implications in (iii) and (iv) follow by taking $(p, p_{m+1}) = (a, 1)$ and $(p, p_{m+1}) = (p, 0)$ respectively in (1) $\Rightarrow$ (4) of lemma 3.4.

The backward implications in (iii) and (iv) follow by taking (p, p_{m+1}) as above, and substituting $t = 0$ in

$$\begin{aligned} f(H) = 0 &\Longrightarrow f\big((1 - p_{m+1}t)H + tp\big) = 0 \\ &\Longrightarrow f\big((1 - q_{m+1}u)\big((1 - p_{m+1}t)H + tp\big) + uq\big) = 0 \end{aligned}$$

□

Theorem 3.6. *Let $H \in L[x]^m$. Then the following holds.*

(i) *If $a \in L^m$ and $b \in L^m$ are image apices of H over K, then for all $\lambda \in L$, $(1-\lambda)a + \lambda b$ is an image apex of H over K as well.*

(ii) *If $a \in L^m$ and $b \in L^m$ are image apices of H over K, then for all $\lambda \in L$, $\lambda(a - b)$ is either zero or a projective image apex of H over K.*

(iii) *If $a \in L^m$ is an image apex and $p \in L^m$ is a projective image apex of H over K, then for all $\lambda \in L$, $a + \lambda p$ is an image apex of H over K as well.*

(iv) *If $p \in L^m$ and $q \in L^m$ are projective image apices of H over K, then for all $\lambda, \mu \in L$, $\lambda p + \mu q$ is either zero or a projective image apex of H over K as well.*

Proof. Take $f \in K[y]$ arbitrary, such that $f(H) = 0$. If a is an image apex of H over K, then $f((1-t)H + ta) = 0$. If p is a projective image apex of H over K, then $f(H + tp) = 0$.

(i) From (1) $\Rightarrow$ (3) of lemma 3.4, it follows that $f\big((1-t-u)H + ta + ub\big) = 0$. Now substitute $t = (1-\lambda)t$ and $u = \lambda t$ in the given order.

(ii) From (1) $\Rightarrow$ (3) of lemma 3.4, it follows that $f\big((1-t-u)H + ta + ub\big) = 0$. Now substitute $t = \lambda t$ and $u = -\lambda t$ in the given order.

(iii) From (1) $\Rightarrow$ (3) of lemma 3.4, it follows that $f\big((1-u)H + tp + ua\big) = 0$. Now substitute $t = \lambda u$.

(iv) From (1) $\Rightarrow$ (3) of lemma 3.4, it follows that $f\big(H + tp + uq\big) = 0$. Now substitute $t = \lambda t$ and $u = \mu t$ in the given order. □

Lemma 3.7. *Let $H \in L[x]^m$ and $i \leq m$. Then e_i is a projective image apex of H over K, if and only if H_i is algebraically independent over K of $H_1, H_2, \ldots, H_{i-1}, H_{i+1}, H_{i+2}, \ldots, H_m$.*

Proof. We only prove the forward implication, since the converse is similar. Assume that e_i is a projective image apex of H. From (ii) of proposition 3.2 and the fact that the substitution $t = t + H_i$ has an inverse, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}\operatorname{trdeg}_K K(H) &= \operatorname{trdeg}_K K(H + te_i)\\ &= \operatorname{trdeg}_K K(H_1, H_2, \ldots, H_{i-1}, t, H_{i+1}, H_{i+2}, \ldots, H_m)\\ &= \operatorname{trdeg}_K K(H_1, H_2, \ldots, H_{i-1}, \quad H_{i+1}, H_{i+2}, \ldots, H_m) + 1\end{aligned}$$

So H_i is algebraically independent over K of $H_1, H_2, \ldots, H_{i-1}, H_{i+1}, H_{i+2}, \ldots, H_m$ indeed. □

Proposition 3.8. *Let $H \in L[x]^m$, such that $e_1, e_2, \ldots, e_s$ are projective image apices of H over K.*

(i) *$a \in L^m$ is an image apex of H over K, if and only if $(a_{s+1}, a_{s+2}, \ldots, a_m)$ is an image apex of $(H_{s+1}, H_{s+2}, \ldots, H_m)$ over K.*

(ii) *If $p \in L^m$ such that $p_i \neq 0$ for some $i > s$, then p is a projective image apex of H over K, if and only if $(p_{s+1}, p_{s+2}, \ldots, p_m)$ is a projective image apex of $(H_{s+1}, H_{s+2}, \ldots, H_m)$ over K.*

(iii) $\operatorname{trdeg}_K K(H) = \operatorname{trdeg}_K K(H_{s+1}, H_{s+2}, \ldots, H_m) + s$.

Proof. We may assume that $s = 1$, because the general case follows by induction. The 'only if'-parts of (i) and (ii) follow from proposition 3.1. To prove the 'if'-parts, suppose that $\tilde{q} := (q_2, q_3, \ldots, q_m)$ is a (projective) image apex of $\tilde{H} := (H_2, H_3, \ldots, H_m)$.

Using proposition 3.1 and (iv) of corollary 3.5, we deduce that $(0, \tilde{q})$ is a (projective) image apex of $(0, \tilde{H})$ and $(t, \tilde{H})$ respectively over K. By substituting $t = t \pm H_1$, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} f\big(t, \tilde{H}\big) = 0 &\Longleftarrow f\big(H_1 + t, \tilde{H}\big) = 0\\ f\big(t, \tilde{H} + u\tilde{q}\big) = 0 &\Longrightarrow f\big(H_1 + t, \tilde{H} + u\tilde{q}\big) = 0\\ f\big((1-u)t, (1-u)\tilde{H} + u\tilde{q}\big) = 0 &\Longrightarrow f\big((1-u)(H_1 + t), (1-u)\tilde{H} + u\tilde{q}\big) = 0\end{aligned}$$

Consequently, $(0, \tilde{q})$ is a (projective) image apex of $(H_1 + t, \tilde{H})$ over K.

Since e_1 is a projective image apex of H over K, we deduce from (iv) of corollary 3.5 that $(0, \tilde{q})$ is a (projective) image apex of H over K. Furthermore,

$q = (q_1, \tilde{q})$ is a (projective) image apex of H over K on account of (iii) or (iv) of theorem 3.6. This proves the 'if'-parts of (i) and (ii).

(iii) follows from the case $i = 1$ of (the proof of) lemma 3.7. □

Corollary 3.9. *Suppose that K is algebraically closed in L. Let $H \in L[x]^m$ and define $r := \operatorname{trdeg}_K K(H)$. Say that H has exactly s independent projective image apices $p \in K^m$ over K. Then the following statements are equivalent:*

(1) *$r \leq s$;*

(2) *$r - 1 \leq s \leq r$ and H has an image apex $a \in K^m$ over K;*

(3) *the ideal $(f \in K[y] \mid f(H) = 0)$ is generated by polynomials of degree at most one.*

Furthermore, if any of (1), (2), (3) *is satisfied, then the constant part of H is an image apex of H over K.*

Proof. We may assume that $e_1, e_2, \ldots, e_s$ are projective image apices of H. Notice that K is algebraically closed in $L(x)$ as well as L.

(1) ⇒ (2) From proposition 3.8, it follows that we may assume that $s = 0$. Assume (1). Then $0 \leq r \leq s = 0$, so $r = 0$ and $r - 1 \leq s \leq r$. Since $r = 0$, it follows that every component of H is algebraic over K. As K is algebraically closed in $L(x)$, we deduce that $a := H \in K^m$. So $H = (1 - t)H + ta$ and a is an image apex of H over K.

(2) ⇒ (3) If $r = m$, then $(f \in K[y] \mid f(H) = 0) = (1)$, so assume that $r < m$. Assume (2). Then $s + 2 \leq r + 1 \leq m$. From (iii) of proposition 3.8, it follows that $\operatorname{trdeg}_K K(H_{s+1}, H_{s+2}) \leq 1$, so there exists a nonzero $f \in K[y_{s+1}, y_{s+2}]$ such that $f(H) = 0$.

Since a is an image apex of H over K, it follows that

$$f\big((1-t)H + ta\big) = 0 \qquad \text{and} \qquad f\big((1-t)(H-a) + a\big) = 0$$

As K is algebraically closed in $L(x)$, we can substitute $t = 1 - (H_1 - a_1)^{-1}$, provided $H_1 - a_1 \neq 0$, to obtain

$$f\Big(\frac{H-a}{H_1-a_1} + a\Big) = 0 \qquad \text{and} \qquad \frac{H_2 - a_2}{H_1 - a_1} \in K$$

More generally, we can deduce that the last $m - s$ components of $H - a$ are linearly dependent over K in pairs. These are $m - s - 1 \geq m - r$ independent linear forms in $K[y]$, so $(g \in K[y] \mid g(H-a) = 0)$ is generated by linear forms, and (3) follows.

(3) ⇒ (1) Assume (3). Then $(f \in K[y] \mid f(H) = 0)$ is generated by $m - r$ polynomials of degree at most one. There are r independent vectors p which vanish on the linear parts of these $m - r$ polynomials of degree at most one. A straightforward computation shows that these r independent vectors p are projective image apices of H over K, which gives (1).

The last claim follows from the proof of (1) $\Rightarrow$ (2) and (i) of proposition 3.8, because $H(0) - a$ is an L-linear combination of $e_1, e_2, \ldots, e_s$. $\square$

Proposition 3.10. *Let $H \in L[x]^m$. Then the zero vector is an image apex of (tH, t) over K, and the following holds.*

(i) *a is an image apex of H over K, if and only if $(a, 1)$ is a (projective) image apex of $\tilde{H}$ over K.*

(ii) *p is a projective image apex of H over K, if and only if $(p, 0)$ is a (projective) image apex of $\tilde{H}$ over K and $p \neq 0$.*

Proof. From (i) of proposition 3.5 and proposition 3.3, we deduce that the zero vector is an image apex of $\big((1-t)H, (1-t)\big)$ and (tH, t) respectively over K. Hence it follows from (ii) and (iii) of theorem 3.6 that (q, q_{m+1}) is a nonzero image apex of (tH, t) over K, if and only if (q, q_{m+1}) is a projective image apex of (tH, t) over K. So it remains to prove (i) and (ii), where we may ignore the parentheses around 'projective' in (i) and (ii).

Notice that

$$\begin{aligned} f\big((1-q_{m+1}u)H + uq\big)\big|_{u=u/(t+q_{m+1}u)} &= f\left(\frac{\big((t+q_{m+1}u) - q_{m+1}u\big)H + uq}{t+q_{m+1}u}\right) \\ &= f\big((t+uq_{m+1})^{-1}(tH+uq)\big) \end{aligned}$$

and $f\big((t+uq_{m+1})^{-1}(tH+uq)\big)\big|_{t=1-uq_{m+1}} = f\big((1-q_{m+1}u)H + uq\big)$. Hence

$$f\big((1-q_{m+1}u)H + uq\big) = 0 \Longleftrightarrow f\big((t+uq_{m+1})^{-1}(tH+uq)\big) = 0$$

So if $g = y_{m+1}^i f(y_{m+1}^{-1}y)$ for some $i \geq \deg f$, then

$$f\big((1-q_{m+1}u)H + uq\big) = 0 \Longleftrightarrow g(tH+uq, t+uq_{m+1}) = 0 \qquad (3.1)$$

If we substitute $u = 0$ on both sides of (3.1), then we see that $f(H) = 0 \Longleftrightarrow g(tH, t) = 0$. Using that and (3.1) itself, the 'only if'-parts of (i) and (ii) follow by taking $q_{m+1} = 1$ and $q_{m+1} = 0$ respectively.

To prove the 'if'-parts of (i) and (ii) as well, take any $g \in K[y, y_{m+1}]$ such that $g(tH, t) = 0$ and let g_i be the coefficient of t^i of $g(ty, ty_{m+1})$. Then $g_i(tH, t)$ is homogeneous of degree i, so there exists an $f_i \in K[y]$ of degree at most i such that $g_i = y_{m+1}^i f(y_{m+1}^{-1}y)$. Furthermore, $g_i(tH, t)$ is t^i times the coefficient of t^i of $g(tH, t)$, which is zero. Hence the 'if'-parts of (i) and (ii) can be proved in a similar manner as the 'only if'-parts. $\square$

4 Inheritance

Proposition 4.1. *Suppose that $h \in L[x]^m$ and $H \in L[X]^M$ are dB-paired through matrices $B \in \mathrm{Mat}_{m,M}(K)$ and $C \in \mathrm{Mat}_{N,n}(L)$.*

(i) *Suppose that $a \in L^m$ is an image apex of H over K. Then Ba is an image apex of both h and BH over K, and $(1-t)H+ta$ is algebraic over $K\big((1-t)BH+tBa\big)$. Furthermore, if $Ba' = Ba$, then a' is an image apex of H over K, if and only if $a' = a$.*

(ii) *Suppose that p is a projective image apex of H over K. Then Bp is a projective image apex of both h and BH over K, and $H+tp$ is algebraic over $K\big(BH+tBp\big)$. Furthermore, if $Bp' = Bp$, then p' is a projective image apex of H over K, if and only if $p' = p$.*

Proof. We only prove the first claim, because the second claim is similar. On account of proposition 3.1, Ba is an image apex of BH over K. By definition of h, $f\big((1-t)BH+tBa\big) = 0 \Longrightarrow f\big((1-t)h+tBa\big) = 0$ for all $f \in K[y]$. Hence we deduce from proposition 2.2 that Ba is an image apex of h as well.

From proposition 3.2 and (2.1), it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}\operatorname{trdeg}_K K\big((1-t)H+ta\big) &= \operatorname{trdeg}_K K\big(H\big) = \operatorname{trdeg}_K K\big(BH\big)\\ &= \operatorname{trdeg}_K K\big((1-t)BH+tBa\big)\end{aligned}$$

Since $K\big((1-t)BH+tBa\big) \subseteq K\big((1-t)H+ta\big)$, we deduce that $(1-t)H+ta$ is algebraic over $K\big((1-t)BH+tBa\big)$.

Suppose that $a' \in L^m$ is another image apex of H over K, such that $Ba' = Ba$. Then $(1-t)H+ta'$ is algebraic over $K\big((1-t)BH+tBa'\big) = K\big((1-t)BH+tBa\big)$ as well. So $t(a'-a) = \big((1-t)H+ta'\big) - \big((1-t)H+ta\big)$ is algebraic over $K\big((1-t)BH+tBa\big)$. Hence $a' = a$ on account of proposition 3.2. □

Definition 4.2. Suppose that $h \in L[x]^m$ and $H \in L[X]^M$ are dB-paired through matrices $B \in \operatorname{Mat}_{m,M}(K)$ and $C \in \operatorname{Mat}_{N,n}(L)$.

We say that an image apex $a' \in L^m$ of h over K *is inherited from* H if $a' = Ba$ for some image apex $a \in L^m$ of H over K (which is unique if it exists).

We say that a projective image apex $p' \in L^m$ of h over K *is inherited from* H if $p' = Bp$ for some projective image apex $p \in L^m$ of H over K (which is unique if it exists).

Theorem 4.3. *Assume that $h \in L[x]^m$ and $H \in L[X]^M$ are dB-paired through matrices $B \in \operatorname{Mat}_{m,M}(K)$ and $C \in \operatorname{Mat}_{N,n}(L)$. Suppose that*

$$B = B^{(3)}B^{(1)} = B^{(4)}B^{(2)} \qquad \text{and} \qquad C = C^{(1)}C^{(3)} = C^{(2)}C^{(4)}$$

such that $B^{(1)}, B^{(2)}, B^{(3)}, B^{(4)}$ are matrices over K, and $C^{(1)}, C^{(2)}, C^{(3)}, C^{(4)}$ are matrices over L, with appropriate dimensions.

Then $H^{(i)} := B^{(i)}H(C^{(i)}X)$ and H are dB-paired through $B^{(i)}$ and $C^{(i)}$ for both $i \leq 2$. Furthermore, h and $H^{(i)}$ are dB-paired through $B^{(i+2)}$ and $C^{(i+2)}$ for both $i \leq 2$.



Let $q \in L^m$ be an image apex or a projective image apex of h over K. If q is inherited from H, then q is inherited from $H^{(i)}$ for both i and from $B^{(i)}H$ for both i.

If q is inherited from $B^{(i)}H$ for both i and

$$\ker B^{(1)} \cap \ker B^{(2)} = \{0\}$$

then q is inherited from H. Furthemore, the (projective) image apex $Q \in L^m$ of H over K such that $BQ = q$ is determined by $B^{(1)}Q = Q^{(1)}$ and $B^{(2)}Q = Q^{(2)}$, where $Q^{(i)}$ is a (projective) image apex of $B^{(i)}H$ over K such that $q = B^{(i+2)}Q^{(i)}$ for both i.

Proof. We only prove the case where q is a projective image apex of h.

To prove the first claim of this theorem, suppose that q is inherited from H, say that $q = BQ$, such that Q is a projective image apex of H. From proposition 4.1, it follows that $B^{(i)}Q$ is a projective image apex of $H^{(i)}$ for both i and of $B^{(i)}H$ for both i. So $q = B^{(i+2)}B^{(i)}Q$ is inherited from $H^{(i)}$ for both i and from $B^{(i)}H$ for both i, which is the first claim of this theorem.

To prove th second claim, suppose that q is inherited from $B^{(i)}H$ for both i and that $\ker B^{(1)} \cap \ker B^{(2)} = \{0\}$. Then for both i, there exists a $Q^{(i)}$ which is a projective image apex of $B^{(i)}H$, such that $q = B^{(i+2)}Q^{(i)}$.

Take $i \leq 2$ arbitrary. From proposition 4.1, it follows that q is also a projective image apex of $B^{(i+2)}B^{(i)}H = BH$. From proposition 3.2 and (2.1), it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}\operatorname{trdeg}_K K\big(B^{(i)}H + tQ^{(i)}\big) &= \operatorname{trdeg}_K K\big(B^{(i)}H\big) = \operatorname{trdeg}_K K\big(H\big) \\ &= \operatorname{trdeg}_K K\big(BH\big) = \operatorname{trdeg}_K K\big(BH + tq\big)\end{aligned}$$

Since

$$K\big(B^{(i)}H + tQ^{(i)}\big) \supseteq K\big(B^{(i+2)}(B^{(i)}H + tQ^{(i)})\big) = K\big(BH + tq\big)$$

we deduce that $B^{(i)}H + tQ^{(i)}$ is algebraic over $K\big(BH + tq\big)$.

Take $j \leq M$ arbitrary. Since $\ker B^{(1)} \cap \ker B^{(2)} = \{0\}$, the row spaces of $B^{(1)}$ and $B^{(2)}$ add up to K^M. Since the j-th standard basis unit vector of K^M is included, there exists a $Q_j \in K$ such that $H_j + tQ_j$ is algebraic over $K\big(BH+tq\big)$. Let $Q = (Q_1, Q_2, \ldots, Q_M)$. Then $H+tQ$ and hence also $BH+tBQ$ is algebraic over $K\big(BH + tq\big)$. On account of proposition 3.2, t is not algebraic over $K\big(BH + tq\big)$, so $q = BQ$ and

$$\operatorname{trdeg}_K K\big(H + tQ\big) = \operatorname{trdeg}_K K\big(BH + tq\big) = \operatorname{trdeg}_K K\big(BH\big) = \operatorname{trdeg}_K K\big(H\big)$$

It follows from proposition 3.2 that Q is a projective image apex of H, which is the second claim of this theorem.

If $\tilde{Q} \in L^m$ satisfies $B^{(i)}\tilde{Q} = Q^{(i)}$ for both i, then $Q - \tilde{Q} \in \ker B^{(1)} \cap \ker B^{(2)} = \{0\}$. So $B^{(1)}Q = Q^{(1)}$ and $B^{(2)}Q = Q^{(2)}$ determine Q, which is the last claim of this theorem. □

Lemma 4.4. *Let L be an extension field of a field K and $H \in K[x]^m$. Suppose that $g \in L[y]$, say that $g = \lambda_1 g^{(1)} + \lambda_2 g^{(2)} + \cdots + \lambda_r g^{(r)}$, where $g^{(i)} \in K[y]$ and $\lambda_i \in L$ for all i.*

If $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \ldots, \lambda_r$ are linearly independent over K, then $g(H) = 0$ implies $g^{(i)}(H) = 0$ for all i.

Proof. Suppose that $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \ldots, \lambda_r$ are linearly independent over K. Then $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \ldots, \lambda_r$ are linearly independent over $K(x)$ as well. Since

$$g(H) = \lambda_1 g^{(1)}(H) + \lambda_2 g^{(2)}(H) + \cdots + \lambda_r g^{(r)}(H)$$

it follows that $g(H) = 0$ implies $g^{(i)}(H) = 0$ for all i. □

Lemma 4.5. *Suppose that K is algebraically closed in L. Assume that $f \in K[y]$ and $g \in L[y]$, such that $g \mid f$ over $L[y]$. Then there exists a unit $\lambda \in L$ such that $\lambda^{-1}g \in K[y]$.*

Proof. Let $d := \deg g$. We distinguish two cases.

- $f \in K[y_1]$.
  Then there exists an extension field $\tilde{L}$ of L, such that f decomposes into linear factors over $\tilde{L}$. So there are $\alpha_i \in \tilde{L}$ such that

  $$g = \lambda \prod_{i=1}^{d} (y_1 - \alpha_i)$$

  where λ is the leading coefficient of g and $d := \deg g$. From $g \mid f \in K[y_1]$ it follows that $f(\alpha_i) = 0$ for all i. So α_i is algebraic over K for all i. Furthermore, since the coefficients of $\lambda^{-1}g$ are contained in $K[\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \ldots, \alpha_d]$, they are algebraic over K as well. On the other hand, $\lambda^{-1}g \in L[y]$ and K is algebraically closed in L, so $\lambda^{-1}g \in K[y_1]$.

- $f \notin K[y_1]$.
  Define

$$\tilde{f} := f\Big(y_1, y_1^{(d+1)}, y_1^{(d+1)^2}, \ldots, y_1^{(d+1)^{m-1}}\Big)$$
$$\tilde{g} := g\Big(y_1, y_1^{(d+1)}, y_1^{(d+1)^2}, \ldots, y_1^{(d+1)^{m-1}}\Big)$$

  Then $\tilde{g} \mid \tilde{f}$ over L. From the case $f \in K[y_1]$ above, it follows that there exists a $\lambda \in L$ such that $\lambda^{-1}\tilde{g} \in K[y]$. As $d+1 > \deg f$, the set of nonzero coefficients of $\tilde{g}$ is the same as that of g. So $\lambda^{-1}g \in K[y]$. □

Lemma 4.6. *Let L be an extension field of a field K of characteristic zero. Take $H \in L[x]^m$ and $p \in L^m$.*

Suppose that $\operatorname{trdeg}_K K(H) \leq \operatorname{trdeg}_L L(H) = m - 1$. *Then there exists a nonzero $f \in K[y]$ such that $f(H) = 0$. If we take f as such of minimum degree, then $F := (\nabla_y f)(H) \neq 0$. Furthermore, $F^{\mathrm{t}} \cdot \mathcal{J}H = 0$ and the following statements are equivalent:*

(1) *p is a projective image apex over K of H or zero;*

(2) *p is a projective image apex over L of H or zero;*

(3) *$G^{\mathrm{t}} \cdot p = 0$ for every $G \in L(x)$, such that $G^{\mathrm{t}} \cdot \mathcal{J}H = 0$;*

(4) *there exists a nonzero $G \in L(x)^m$ such that $G^{\mathrm{t}} \cdot \mathcal{J}H = 0$ and $G^{\mathrm{t}} \cdot p = 0$;*

(5) *$\mathcal{J}_y g \cdot p = 0$ for every $g \in L[y]$ of minimum degree, such that $g(H) = 0$;*

(6) *there exists a nonzero $g \in L[y]$ such that $g(H) = 0$ and $\mathcal{J}_y g \cdot p = 0$.*

Proof. Suppose that $\operatorname{trdeg}_K K(H) \leq \operatorname{trdeg}_L L(H) = m - 1$. Then f exists. Furthermore, it follows from proposition 1.2.9 of either [vdE] or [dB1] that $\operatorname{rk} \mathcal{J}H = m - 1$.

Since f has minimum degree and $\deg \nabla_y f < \deg f$, we deduce that $F \neq 0$. From the chain rule, it follows that $\mathcal{J}f(H) = (\mathcal{J}_y f)|_{y=H} \cdot \mathcal{J}H$, so $F^{\mathrm{t}} \cdot \mathcal{J}H = 0$.

(2) ⇒ (1) This follows from $K[y] \subseteq L[y]$ and the definition of projective image apex.

(1) ⇒ (3) Assume (1). Then $f(H + tp) = 0$, so

$$0 = \Big(\frac{\partial}{\partial t} f(H + tp)\Big)\Big|_{t=0} = \big((\mathcal{J}_y f)|_{y=H+tp} \cdot p\big)\big|_{t=0} = F^{\mathrm{t}} \cdot p$$

Now take any $G \in L(x)$, such that $G^{\mathrm{t}} \cdot \mathcal{J}H = 0$. Since $\operatorname{rk} \mathcal{J}H = m - 1$, there is only one dependence between the columns of $\mathcal{J}H$, so G is dependent as a vector over $L(x)$ of F. Hence $G^{\mathrm{t}} \cdot p = 0$.

(3) ⇒ (4) As we can take $G = F$, there exists a $G \in L(X)^m$ such that $G^{\mathrm{t}} \cdot \mathcal{J}H = 0$. This gives (3) ⇒ (4).

(4) ⇒ (5) Assume (4). Take any $g \in L[y]$ of minimum degree, such that $g(H) = 0$, if such a g exists. Just like $F \neq 0$, $\tilde{G} := (\nabla_y g)(H) \neq 0$. Furthermore, $\tilde{G}^{\mathrm{t}} \cdot \mathcal{J}H = 0$.

Since $\operatorname{rk} \mathcal{J}H = m - 1$, there is only one dependence between the columns of $\mathcal{J}H$, so $\tilde{G}$ is dependent as a vector over $L(x)$ of G. Hence $\tilde{G}^{\mathrm{t}} \cdot p = 0$. Since g has minimum degree, we conclude that $\mathcal{J}_y g \cdot p = 0$.

(5) ⇒ (6) As $f \in L[y]$ and $f(H) = 0$, there exists a $g \in L[y]$ of minimum degree, such that $g(H) = 0$. This gives (5) ⇒ (6).

(6) ⇒ (2) Assume (6). Then $g(H) = 0$ and

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} g(H + tp) = \big((\nabla_y g)(H + tp)\big)^{\mathrm{t}} \cdot p = \big((\nabla_y g)^{\mathrm{t}} \cdot p\big)\big|_{y=H+tp} = 0$$

Hence $g(H + tp) = 0$, so $\operatorname{trdeg}_L L(H + tp) \leq m - 1 = \operatorname{trdeg}_L L(H)$. Since $\operatorname{trdeg}_L L(H + tp) \geq \operatorname{trdeg}_L L(H)$ follows by substituting $t = 0$, (1) follows from (ii) of proposition 3.2. □

Theorem 4.7. *Suppose that K has characteristic zero and that K is algebraically closed in L. Assume that $H \in L[x]^m$, such that $\operatorname{trdeg}_K K(H) \leq \operatorname{trdeg}_L L(H)$. Let $\tilde{L}$ be an extension field of L and suppose that $p \in \tilde{L}^m$, such that p is a projective image apex of H over K.*

Take $\lambda_i \in \tilde{L}$, such that $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \ldots, \lambda_r$ are linearly independent over K and

$$p = \lambda_1 p^{(1)} + \lambda_2 p^{(2)} + \cdots + \lambda_r p^{(r)}$$

where $p^{(i)} \in K^m$ for each i. Then $p^{(i)}$ is a projective image apex of H over $\tilde{L}$ or zero for each i.

Proof. We distinguish two cases.

- $\operatorname{trdeg}_L L(H) = m - 1$.
  Since $\operatorname{trdeg}_K K(H) \leq \operatorname{trdeg}_L L(H) = m - 1$, there exists a nonzero polynomial $f \in K[y]$ such that $f(H) = 0$. Take f as such of minimum degree and define $g := \mathcal{J}_y f \cdot p$. If $g_i := \mathcal{J}_y f \cdot p^{(i)} = 0$ for all i, then it follows from (6) ⇒ (2) of lemma 4.6 that $p^{(i)}$ is a projective image apex of H over $\tilde{L}$ or zero for each i, because

  $$\operatorname{trdeg}_{\tilde{L}} \tilde{L}(H) = \operatorname{trdeg}_L L(H) = m - 1 \tag{4.1}$$

  We show that $g_i = 0$ for every i indeed.

  Suppose first that $K = L$. From lemma 4.6, it follows that $(\mathcal{J}_y f)(H) \cdot \mathcal{J}H = 0$. Since $f(H + tp) = 0$, we deduce from (4.1) and (1) ⇒ (3) of lemma 4.6 that $g(H) = (\mathcal{J}_y f)(H) \cdot p = 0$. Hence it follows from lemma 4.4 that $g^{(i)}(H) = 0$ for all i. Since f has minimum degree and $\deg g_i < \deg f$ for all i, we conclude that $g^{(i)} = 0$ for every i.

  Suppose next that $K \neq L$. Since $\operatorname{trdeg}_L L(H) = m - 1$, the ideal $\mathfrak{p} := (\tilde{f} \in L[y] \mid \tilde{f}(H) = 0)$ is principal. As $f(H) = 0$, any polynomial $\tilde{f}$ which

generates $\mathfrak{p}$ is a divisor of f. From lemma 4.5, it follows that $\mathfrak{p} = (f)$, so f has minimum degree as a polynomial over L as well. Hence the case $L = K$ above (with different $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \ldots$) tells us that $g = 0$. As $f \in K[y]$, it follows from lemma 4.4 that $g^{(i)} = 0$ for every i.

- $\operatorname{trdeg}_L L(H) < m - 1$.
  We will apply theorem 4.3 to show that $p^{(i)}$ is a projective image apex of H for each i. Since $\operatorname{trdeg}_L L(H) \leq m - 2$, there exists a matrix $B \in \operatorname{Mat}_{m-2,m}(K)$ of rank $m - 2$, such that $\operatorname{trdeg}_L L(BH) = \operatorname{trdeg}_L L(H)$. Take any $B^{(1)} \in \operatorname{Mat}_{m-1,m}(K)$ or rank $m - 1$, such that the row space of $B^{(1)}$ contains that of B, say that $B = B^{(3)}B^{(1)}$.

  Take $B^{(2)}$ and $B^{(4)}$ in a similar manner as $B^{(1)}$ and $B^{(3)}$ respectively, but in such a way that the rows spaces of $B^{(1)}$ and $B^{(2)}$ are different. Since the row spaces of $B^{(1)}$ and $B^{(2)}$ have codimension one, we deduce that they add up to a space of codimension less than one, i.e. K^m. So $\ker B^{(1)} \cap \ker B^{(2)} = \{0\}$.

  Notice that by assumption,

$$f\big(B^{(1)}H\big) = 0 \Longrightarrow f\big(B^{(1)}H + tB^{(1)}p\big) = 0$$
$$f\big(B^{(2)}H\big) = 0 \Longrightarrow f\big(B^{(2)}H + tB^{(2)}p\big) = 0$$

  for every $f \in K[y_1, y_2, \ldots, y_{m-1}]$. Furthermore, it follows from $\operatorname{trdeg}_K K(H) \leq \operatorname{trdeg}_L L(H) = \operatorname{trdeg}_L L(BH)$ that

$$\operatorname{trdeg}_K K(B^{(1)}H) \leq \operatorname{trdeg}_L L(B^{(1)}H)$$
$$\operatorname{trdeg}_K K(B^{(2)}H) \leq \operatorname{trdeg}_L L(B^{(2)}H)$$

  By induction on m, $B^{(1)}p^{(i)}$ and $B^{(2)}p^{(i)}$ are projective image apices of $B^{(1)}H$ and $B^{(2)}H$ respectively for each i. From proposition 3.1, it follows that $Bp^{(i)}$ is a projective image apex of BH for each i. Now apply theorem 4.3. □

Theorem 4.8. *Suppose that K has characteristic zero and that K is algebraically closed in L. Assume that $H \in L[x]^m$, such that $\operatorname{trdeg}_K K(H) \leq \operatorname{trdeg}_L L(H)$. Let $\tilde{L}$ be an extension field of L and suppose that $a \in \tilde{L}^m$, such that p is an image apex of H over K.*

Then there are $\mu_i \in \tilde{L}$ which are linearly independent over K, such that $\mu_1 + \mu_2 + \cdots + \mu_r = 1$,

$$a = \mu_1 a^{(1)} + \mu_2 a^{(2)} + \cdots + \mu_r a^{(r)}$$

and $a^{(i)} \in K^m$ is an image apex of H over $\tilde{L}$ for each i.

Proof. From proposition 3.10, it follows that $p := (a, 1)$ is a projective image apex of $\tilde{H} := (x_{n+1}H, x_{n+1})$. Take λ_i and $p^{(i)}$ as in theorem 4.7, except that $p^{(i)} \in K^{n+1}$ instead of K^n. Then $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \ldots, \lambda_r$ are linearly independent over

K, $p = \lambda_1 p^{(1)} + \lambda_2 p^{(2)} + \cdots + \lambda_r p^{(r)}$ and $p^{(i)} \in K^{n+1}$ is a projective image apex of $\tilde{H}$ over L'.

Since the last coordinate of p is nonzero, the last row of $\left(p^{(1)} \,\middle|\, p^{(2)} \,\middle|\, \cdots \,\middle|\, p^{(r)}\right)$ is nonzero as well, so there exists a $T \in \mathrm{GL}_r(K)$ such that the last row of

$$\left(q^{(1)} \,\middle|\, q^{(2)} \,\middle|\, \cdots \,\middle|\, q^{(r)}\right) := \left(p^{(1)} \,\middle|\, p^{(2)} \,\middle|\, \cdots \,\middle|\, p^{(r)}\right) \cdot T$$

equals $(1^1, 1^2, \ldots, 1^r)$. Furthermore, we deduce from (iv) of theorem 3.6 that $q^{(i)}$ is a projective image apex of $\tilde{H}$ for each i as well.

Define $\mu := T^{-1}\lambda$. Then $\mu_1 + \mu_2 + \cdots + \mu_r = 1$ indeed, because the last coordinate of $q^{(i)}$ equals 1 for each i, as well as the last coordinate of

$$\begin{aligned} p &= \left(p^{(1)} \,\middle|\, p^{(2)} \,\middle|\, \cdots \,\middle|\, p^{(r)}\right) T \cdot T^{-1}\lambda \\ &= \left(q^{(1)} \,\middle|\, q^{(2)} \,\middle|\, \cdots \,\middle|\, q^{(r)}\right) \cdot \mu \\ &= \mu_1 q^{(1)} + \mu_2 q^{(2)} + \cdots + \mu_r q^{(r)} \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, if we define $a^{(i)}$ by $(a^{(i)}, 1) := q^{(i)}$, then $a = \mu_1 a^{(1)} + \mu_2 a^{(2)} + \cdots + \mu_r a^{(r)}$, and we deduce from proposition 3.10 that $a^{(i)}$ is an image apex of H for each i. □

Theorem 4.9. *Let K be a field of characteristic zero, which is algebraically closed in L. Let $H \in L[x]^m$.*

(i) *Suppose that H has a (projective) image apex $p \in L^m$ over L, but not a (projective) image apex $p^{(1)} \in K^m$ over K. Then*

$$\mathrm{trdeg}_L\, L(H) \leq \mathrm{trdeg}_K\, K(H) - 1$$

(ii) *Suppose that H has a (projective) image apex $a \in L^m$ over K, which is not a (projective) image apex over L. Then*

$$\mathrm{trdeg}_L\, L(H) \leq \mathrm{trdeg}_K\, K(H) - 1$$

(iii) *Suppose that H has a projective image apex $p \in L^m$ over L, but not a projective image apex $p^{(1)} \in K^m$ over K. Suppose that H has a (projective) image apex $a \in L^m$ over K, which is not a (projective) image apex over L. Then*

$$\mathrm{trdeg}_L\, L(H) \leq \mathrm{trdeg}_K\, K(H) - 2$$

(iv) *Suppose that H has an image apex $b \in L^m$ over L, but not an image apex $b^{(1)} \in K^m$ over K. Suppose that H has a (projective) image apex $a \in L^m$ over K, which is not a (projective) image apex over L. Then*

$$\mathrm{trdeg}_L\, L(H) \leq \mathrm{trdeg}_K\, K(H) - 2$$

Proof. We assume that a is an image apex and p is a projective image apex, since that are the cases we need. The other cases are similar.

(i) Suppose that $\operatorname{trdeg}_K K(H) \leq \operatorname{trdeg}_L L(H)$. From theorem 4.7 and theorem 4.8, it follows that H has a projective image apex $p^{(1)} \in K^m$ over L, in particular over K. Contradiction.

(ii) From $K \subseteq L$ and proposition 3.2, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq \operatorname{trdeg}_K K\big((1-t)H + ta\big) - \operatorname{trdeg}_L L\big((1-t)H + ta\big) \\ &= \operatorname{trdeg}_K K(H) - (\operatorname{trdeg}_L L(H) + 1) \end{aligned} \tag{4.2}$$

which gives (ii).

(iii) Suppose that $\operatorname{trdeg}_K K(H) \leq \operatorname{trdeg}_L L(H) + 1$. Then (4.2) is an equality, so

$$\operatorname{trdeg}_K K\big((1-t)H + ta\big) = \operatorname{trdeg}_L L\big((1-t)H + ta\big)$$

From theorem 4.7, it follows that $(1-t)H + ta$ has a projective image apex $p^{(1)} \in K^m$ over L, in particular over K. Since a is an image apex of H over K, we deduce from corollary 3.5 that $p^{(1)}$ is a projective image apex of H over K as well. Contradiction.

(iv) The proof is the same as that of (iii), except that theorem 4.8 is used instead of theorem 4.7. □

5 Reduction of dimension with inheritance

This section is 'over K', i.e. dB-pairing is over K, through matrices over K, and (projective) image apices are over K, both as such and as vectors.

Theorem 5.1. *Suppose that $h \in K[x]^m$ and $H \in K[X]^M$ are (symmetrically) dB-paired through matrices B and C, such that $\operatorname{rk} B = m$. Suppose that $h' \in K[x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_{n-j}]^{m-i}$ and h are (symmetrically) dB-paired, such that every image apex of h' is inherited from h and/or every projective image apex of h' is inherited from h.*

Then there exists an $H' \in K[x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_{N-j}]^{M-i}$ such that H' and H are (symmetrically) dB-paired, and every image apex H' is inherited from H and/or every projective image apex H' is inherited from H respectively.

Proof. Notice that h' and H are dB-paired through $B'B$ and CC'. Since $\operatorname{rk} B = m$, we can add $M - m$ rows to B to obtain an element of $\mathrm{GL}_M(K)$. But instead of doing that, we add these rows to $B'B$, to obtain a matrix $\tilde{B}' \in \mathrm{Mat}_{M-i,M}(K)$. In the symmetric case, we take $\tilde{C}' = (\tilde{B}')^{\mathrm{t}}$, otherwise we make $\tilde{C}' \in \mathrm{Mat}_{N,N-j}(L)$ by adding zero or more arbitrary columns to CC'.

Take $H' := \tilde{B}'H(\tilde{C}'x)$. Since h' and H are dB-paired over K through $B'B$ and CC', one can deduce that h' and H' are dB-paired through $\tilde{B} := (I_{m-i}\ 0)$ and $\tilde{C} := (I_{n-j}\ 0)^{\mathrm{t}}$ and that H' and H are dB-paired through $\tilde{B}'$ and $\tilde{C}'$. Furthermore, $\tilde{B}\tilde{B}' = B'B$ and $\tilde{C}'\tilde{C} = CC'$.



Suppose that Q' is a (projective) image apex of H' over K. Then $q' := \tilde{B}Q'$ is a (projective) image apex of h' over K. By assumption, q' is inherited from h. So there exists a (projective) image apex q of h, such that $q' = B'q$.

From propositions 2.2 and 3.3, it follows that Q' and q are (projective) image apices of $\tilde{B}'H$ and BH respectively as well. Hence we can apply heorem 4.3, to deduce that there exists a (projective) image apex Q of H such that $\tilde{B}'Q = Q'$. So Q' is inherited from H. □

Theorem 5.2. *Let K be a field of characteristic zero and $H \in K[x]^M$, such that $\operatorname{trdeg}_K K(H) = M - 2$. Suppose that $0 \leq s < k < M$ and that the polynomial map $H_{s+1}, H_{s+2}, \ldots, H_k$ does not have a projective image apex. Suppose additionally that either* (i) *or* (ii) *is satisfied.*

(i) *$H_{k+1}, H_{k+2}, \ldots, H_M$ does not have a projective image apex.*

(ii) *$H_k, H_{k+1}, H_{k+2}, \ldots, H_M$ does not have a projective image apex and H has an image apex.*

Let

$$h = (H_1, H_2, \ldots, H_s, H_{s+1} + H_M, H_{s+2}, H_{s+3}, \ldots, H_{M-1})$$

Then for both H and h, the projective image apices are exactly those nonzero vectors which are generated by $e_1, e_2, \ldots, e_s$. Furthermore, h and H are dB-paired and the projective image apices of h are inherited from those of H.

Proof. Suppose that P is a projective image apex of H. From (ii) of proposition 3.1, it follows that $P_{s+1} = P_{s+2} = \cdots = P_k = 0$ and $(P_k =) P_{k+1} = P_{k+2} = \cdots = P_M = 0$. So P is a linear combination of $e_1, e_2, \ldots, e_s$ indeed.

Since $H_{s+1}, H_{s+2}, \ldots, H_k$ does not have a projective image apex, it follows from lemma 3.7 that H_{s+1} is algebraically dependent over K of $H_{s+2}, H_{s+3}, \ldots, H_k$. Since $(H_k,)\, H_{k+1}, H_{k+2}, \ldots, H_M$ does not have a projective image apex, it follows from lemma 3.7 that H_M is algebraically dependent over K of $(H_k,)\, H_{k+1}, H_{k+2}, \ldots, H_{M-1}$. So

$$\operatorname{trdeg}_K K(H_1, \ldots, H_s, H_{s+2}, \ldots, H_{M-1}) = \operatorname{trdeg}_K K(H) = M - 2 \qquad (5.1)$$

It follows that $H_1, \ldots, H_s, H_{s+2}, \ldots, H_{M-1}$ is a transcendence basis of $K(H)$ over K. So h and H are dB-paired. Furthermore, $\operatorname{trdeg}_K K(H_{s+1}, H_{s+2}, \ldots, H_k) \geq k - s - 1$, because $k \leq M - 1$. From lemma 3.7, it follows that $\operatorname{trdeg}_K K(H_{s+1}, H_{s+2}, \ldots, H_k) = k - s - 1$.

Since H_M and H_{s+1} are algebraically dependent over K of $H_{s+2}, H_{s+3}, \ldots, H_{M-1}$, it follows from (5.1) that for every $i \leq s$, H_i is algebraically independent over K of $H_1, H_2, \ldots, H_{i-1}, H_{i+1}, H_{i+2}, \ldots, H_M$. On account of lemma 3.7, e_i is a projective image apex of H for each $i \leq s$. It follows from (iv) of theorem 3.6 that every nontrivial linear combination of $e_1, e_2, \ldots, e_s$ is a projective image apex of H.

So we have proved that the projective image apices of H are exactly those nonzero vectors which are generated by $e_1, e_2, \ldots, e_s$. Since h and H are dB-paired, we deduce from (ii) of proposition 4.1 that every nontrivial linear combination of $e_1, e_2, \ldots, e_s$ is a projective image apex of h.

Let $m = M - 1$ and suppose that p is a projective image apex of h. In order to prove that for h, the projective image apices are exactly those nonzero vectors which are generated by $e_1, e_2, \ldots, e_s$ it suffices to show that $p_{s+1} = p_{s+2} = \cdots = p_m = 0$. The last claim of this theorem will then be clear as well, so it remains to show that $p_{s+1} = p_{s+2} = \cdots = p_m = 0$.

Since $\operatorname{trdeg}_K K(H_{s+1}, H_{s+2}, \ldots, H_k) = k - s - 1$, it follows from lemma 4.6 that there exist $F_{s+1}, F_{s+2}, \ldots, F_k \in K[x]$, such that $F^{\mathrm{t}} \cdot \mathcal{J}H = 0$, where

$$F = (0^1, 0^2, \ldots, 0^s, F_{s+1}, F_{s+2}, \ldots, F_k, 0^{k+1}, 0^{k+2}, \ldots, 0^M)$$

As $(H_{s+1}, H_{s+2}, \ldots, H_k)$ does not have a projective image apex, we can use (4) $\Rightarrow$ (1) of lemma 4.6 to deduce that $F_{s+1}, F_{s+2}, \ldots, F_k \in K[x]$ are linearly independent over K,

Let $N = 2n$ and write $\tilde{x} = x_{n+1}, x_{n+2}, \ldots, x_{2n}$.

(i) Define

$$G := \big(H_1(x), H_2(x), \ldots, H_k(x), H_{k+1}(\tilde{x}), H_{k+2}(\tilde{x}), \ldots, H_M(\tilde{x})\big)$$

Then $f(G) = 0 \Longrightarrow f(H) = 0$ for every $f \in K[Y]$. Since G_{s+1} and G_M are algebraically dependent over K of $G_{s+2}, G_{s+3}, \ldots, G_{M-1}$, we can deduce from $\operatorname{trdeg}_K K(H) = M - 2$ that $f(G) = 0 \Longleftrightarrow f(H) = 0$ for every $f \in K[Y]$. Let

$$g = (G_1, G_2, \ldots, G_s, G_{s+1} + G_M, G_{s+2}, G_{s+3}, \ldots, G_m)$$

Then $f(g) = 0 \Longleftrightarrow f(h) = 0$ for every $f \in K[y]$.

Just like $\operatorname{trdeg}_K K(H_{s+1}, H_{s+2}, \ldots, H_k) = k - s - 1$, we can show that $\operatorname{trdeg}_K K(H_{k+1}, H_{k+2}, \ldots, H_M) = M - k - 1$. Furthermore, we can show that there are $\tilde{F}_{k+1}, \tilde{F}_{k+2}, \ldots, \tilde{F}_M \in K[x]$ which are linearly independent over K, such that $\tilde{F}^{\mathrm{t}} \cdot \mathcal{J}H = 0$, where

$$\tilde{F} = (0^1, 0^2, \ldots, 0^s, 0^{s+1}, 0^{s+2}, \ldots, 0^k, \tilde{F}_{k+1}, \tilde{F}_{k+2}, \ldots, \tilde{F}_M)$$

Let $\tilde{f} \in K(x)^m$ be the vector consisting of the first $m = M-1$ coordinates of $F_{s+1}(x)^{-1}F(x) + \tilde{F}_M(\tilde{x})^{-1}\tilde{F}(\tilde{x})$. As $\tilde{f}_{s+1} = 1$, it follows that

$$\tilde{f}^{\mathrm{t}} \cdot \mathcal{J}_X g = (\tilde{f}, 1)^{\mathrm{t}} \cdot \mathcal{J}_X G = \big(F_{s+1}^{-1} \cdot F^{\mathrm{t}} \cdot \mathcal{J}H\big) + \big(\tilde{F}_M^{-1} \cdot \tilde{F}^{\mathrm{t}} \cdot \mathcal{J}H\big)\big|_{x=\tilde{x}} = 0$$

Hence it follows from (1) $\Rightarrow$ (4) of lemma 4.6 that $\tilde{f}^{\mathrm{t}} \cdot p = 0$.

Now suppose that $p_i \neq 0$ for some $i \geq s+1$. If $p_{s+1} \neq 0$, then there exists an $i > s+1$ such that $p_i \neq 0$, because $\tilde{f}_{s+1} = 1 \neq 0$. Hence we can take $i \geq s+2$. We may assume without loss of generality that $s+2 \leq i \leq k$, because the case $k+1 \leq i \leq M-1$ is similar.

Take $\theta \in K^n$ such that $\tilde{F}_M(\theta) \neq 0$. Then the components of $\tilde{F}_M(\theta)^{-1}\tilde{F}(\theta)$ are linearly dependent over K of $\tilde{f}_{s+1} = 1$. From $\tilde{f}|^{\mathrm{t}}_{\tilde{x}=\theta} \cdot p = 0$, it follows that $F_{s+1}^{-1}F_i$ is linearly dependent over K of the other nonzero components of $F_{s+1}^{-1}F$. Contradiction, so $p_{s+1} = p_{s+2} = \cdots = p_m = 0$.

(ii) Let a be an image apex of H. Suppose first that $k = s+1$. Then H_k does not have a projective image apex, so $H_k \in K$ on account of lemma 3.7. Furthermore, $H_k, H_{k+1}, \ldots, H_M$ does not have a projective image apex. So it follows from (ii) of proposition 3.1, with $c = (H_k, 0^{k+1}, 0^{k+2}, \ldots, 0^M)$, that $H_{k+1}, H_{k+2}, \ldots, H_M$ does not have a projective image apex either. Hence (i) is satisfied and the claims follow.

Suppose next that $k > s+1$. From (i) of lemma 3.1, it follows that the zero vector is an image apex of $H - a$. Define

$$G := \Big(\big(H_1(x) - a_1, H_2(x) - a_2, \ldots, H_k(x) - a_k\big) \cdot \big(H_k(\tilde{x}) - a_k\big), \\ \big(H_k(x) - a_k\big) \cdot \big(H_{k+1}(\tilde{x}) - a_{k+1}, \ldots, H_M(x) - a_M\big)\Big)$$

We show that

$$f(G) = 0 \Longrightarrow f(H - a) = 0 \tag{5.2}$$

So assume that $f(G) = 0$. Let

$$\gamma := \big((y_1, y_2, \ldots, y_k) \cdot y_k, y_k \cdot (y_{k+1}, y_{k+2}, \ldots, y_M)\big)$$

Then $f\big(\gamma(H-a)\big) = 0$ follows by substituting $\tilde{x} = x$ in $f(G) = 0$. Since a in an image apex of H, it follows that $f\big((1-t)^2\gamma(H-a)\big) = f\big(\gamma\big((1-t)\cdot (H-a)\big)\big) = 0$, which gives $f(H-a) = 0$ after substituting t by $1 - (\sqrt{H_k - a_k})^{-1}$.

If G_{s+1} and G_M are algebraically dependent over K of $G_{s+2}, \ldots, G_{M-1}$, then we can deduce from $\mathrm{trdeg}_K\, K(H) = M-2$ that $f(G) = 0 \iff f(H) = 0$ for every $f \in K[Y]$. So let us show for instance that G_{s+1} is algebraically dependent over K of $G_{s+2}, \ldots, G_{M-1}$.

Since H_{s+1} is algebraically dependent over K of $H_{s+2}, \ldots, H_k$, there exists a nonzero $f \in K[y_{s+1}, y_{s+2}, \ldots, y_k]$ such that $f(H-a) = 0$. Since the zero

vector is an image apex of $H - a$, we can subsitute $t = 1 - \big(H_k(\tilde{x}) - a_k\big)$ to obtain $f(G) = 0$, because $f \in K[y_{s+1}, y_{s+2}, \ldots, y_k]$.

Since $H_{s+2} - a_{s+2}, H_{s+3} - a_{s+3}, \ldots, H_{M-1} - a_{M-1}$ are algebraically independent over K, it follows from (5.2) that $G_{s+2}, G_{s+3}, \ldots, G_{M-1}$ are algebraically independent over K. As $f \in K[y_{s+1}, y_{s+2}, \ldots, y_{M-1}]$, we deduce that G_{s+1} is algebraically dependent over K of $G_{s+2}, G_{s+3}, \ldots, G_{M-1}$ indeed.

So $f(G) = 0 \iff f(H - a) = 0$ for every $f \in K[Y]$. Let

$$g = (G_1, G_2, \ldots, G_s, G_{s+1} + G_M, G_{s+2}, G_{s+3}, \ldots, G_m)$$

and $\tilde{a} = (a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_s, a_{s+1} + a_M, a_{s+2}, a_{s+3}, \ldots, a_{M-1})$. Then $f(g) = 0 \iff f(h - \tilde{a}) = 0$ for every $f \in K[y]$. The rest of the proof is similar to that of (i). □

Proposition 5.3. *Let K be a field of characteristic zero and $H \in K[X]^M$. Suppose that $\operatorname{rk} \mathcal{J}H < m \leq M$ and let s be the number of independent projective image apices of H. Then there exists an $h \in K[X]^m$, such that h and H are dB-paired, in such a way that every projective image apex of h is inherited, in the following cases:*

(i) $\operatorname{rk} \mathcal{J}H \leq s + 2$;

(ii) *H has an image apex and $\operatorname{rk} \mathcal{J}H \leq s + 3$.*

Proof. Assume without loss of generality that p is a projective image apex of H, if and only if p is a nontrivial linear combination of $e_1, e_2, \ldots, e_s$. By induction, we may assume that $m = M - 1$. Since $\operatorname{rk} \mathcal{J}H < m = M - 1$, it follows that $M \geq M' := \operatorname{rk} \mathcal{J}H + 2$.

From (ii) of proposition 3.8, it follows that we may assume without loss of generality that $H_1, H_2, \ldots, H_{M'-2}$ are a transcendence basis of $K(H)$ over K. Let s' be the number of independent projective apices of $H' = (H_1, H_2, \ldots, H_{M'})$. Since $s' \geq s$, we can deduce that H' satisfies (i) or (ii) as well as H. Hence theorem 5.1 allows us to assume that $M = M' = \operatorname{rk} \mathcal{J}H + 2$. Having been useful, we abandon the assumption that $H_1, H_2, \ldots, H_{M'-2}$ are a transcendence basis of $K(H)$ over K from now on.

From (ii) of proposition 3.8, it follows that $(H_{s+1}, H_{s+2}, \ldots, H_M)$ does not have a projective image apex. So for $k = M$, there exists a $B \in \operatorname{Mat}_{k-s,M}(K)$, such that $\operatorname{rk} B = k - s$ and $(B_1H, B_2H, \ldots, B_{k-s}H)$ does not have a projective image apex. So we can take k as small as possible, such that there exists a $B \in \operatorname{Mat}_{k-s,M}(K)$, such that $\operatorname{rk} B = k - s$ and $(B_1H, B_2H, \ldots, B_{k-s}H)$ does not have a projective image apex. From (ii) of proposition 3.1, it follows that the first s columns of B are zero. Hence there exists a $T \in \mathrm{GL}_M(K)$ of the form

$$T = \begin{pmatrix} I_s & \emptyset \\ \emptyset & * \end{pmatrix}$$

such that B is the submatrix of T which consists of the rows $s+1, s+2, \ldots, k$. Now replace H by TH. Then $(H_{s+1}, H_{s+2}, \ldots, H_k)$ does not have a projective image apex.

Since $M = \operatorname{rk} \mathcal{J}H + 2$, it follows from (iii) of proposition 3.8 that

$$\operatorname{trdeg}_K K(H_{s+2}, H_{s+3}, \ldots, H_M) \leq \operatorname{trdeg}_K K(H) - s = M - 2 - s < M - (s+1)$$

Again from (iii) of proposition 3.8, we deduce that there exists a nonzero vector in $K^{M-(s+1)}$ which is not a projective image apex of $(H_{s+2}, H_{s+3}, \ldots, H_M)$. From (ii) of proposition 3.1, it follows that there exists a $\tilde{T} \in \mathrm{GL}_M(K)$ of the form

$$\tilde{T} = \begin{pmatrix} I_s & \emptyset \\ \emptyset & \tilde{B} \end{pmatrix}$$

such that $\tilde{B} \in \mathrm{GL}_{m-s}(K)$ is lower triangular, and such that there is a set of standard basis unit vectors which forms a maximum set of independent projective image apices of $\big((\tilde{T}H)_{s+2}, (\tilde{T}H)_{s+3}, \ldots, (\tilde{T}H)_M\big)$, say of cardinality $k' - (s+1)$. Now replace H by $\tilde{T}H$. Since $\tilde{T}$ is lower triangular, the property that $(H_{s+1}, H_{s+2}, \ldots, H_k)$ does not have a projective image apex is preserved.

There are $\big(M - (s+1)\big) - \big(k' - (s+1)\big) = M - k'$ standard basis unit vectors which are not projective image apices of $\big(H_{s+2}, H_{s+3}, \ldots, H_M\big)$. If we subsequently replace H by PH for a suitable permutation matrix P, then we can obtain that the above $M - k'$ standard basis unit vectors will become successive, in such a way that the property that $(H_{s+1}, H_{s+2}, \ldots, H_k)$ does not have a projective image apex is preserved. From (ii) of proposition 3.8, it follows that $(H_{k'+1-j}, H_{k'+2-j}, \ldots, H_{M-j})$ does not have a projective image apex for some j such that $0 \leq j \leq k' - (s+1)$.

We show that $j = 0$. If $M - j \leq k$, then $(H_{k'+1-j}, H_{k'+2-j}, \ldots, H_{M-j})$ has less components than $(H_{s'+1}, H_{s'+2}, \ldots, H_k)$, which contradicts the minimality of k. So $M - j > k$. Since $k' > s$ as well, it follows from lemma 3.7 that H_{s+1} and H_{M-j} are algebraically dependent over K of $H_{s+2}, H_{s+3}, \ldots, H_{M-j-1}$. But $M = \operatorname{rk} \mathcal{J}H + 2$, so for each $i > M - j$, H_i is algebraically independent over K of $H_1, H_2, \ldots, H_{i-1}, H_{i+1}, H_{i+2}, \ldots, H_M$. On account of lemma 3.7, we have $j = 0$ indeed.

If $k' = s + 1$, then we can take $h = (H_1, H_2, \ldots, H_s, H_{s+2}, H_{s+3}, \ldots, H_M)$. So assume that $k' \geq s + 2$.

(i) Assume that $\operatorname{rk} \mathcal{J}H \leq s + 2$. Since $M - 2 = \operatorname{rk} \mathcal{J}H \leq s + 2 \leq k'$, we have $M \leq k' + 2$. By minimality of k, $k - s \leq M - k' = 2$. So $k \leq s + 2 \leq k'$. It follows from (i) of theorem 5.2 that we can take h as in theorem 5.2.

(ii) Assume that H has an image apex and $\operatorname{rk} \mathcal{J}H \leq s + 3$. Since $M - 2 = \operatorname{rk} \mathcal{J}H \leq s + 3 \leq k' + 1$, we have $M \leq k' + 3$. By minimality of k, $k - s \leq M - k' = 3$. So $k \leq s + 3 \leq k' + 1$. It follows from (ii) of theorem 5.2 that we can take h as in theorem 5.2. □

Theorem 5.4. *Let K be a field of characteristic zero and $H \in K[X]^N$. Suppose that $\operatorname{rk} \mathcal{J}H < n \leq N$ and let s be the number of independent projective apices*

of H. Then there exists an $h \in K[x]^n$ such that h and H are symmetrically dB-paired, in such a way that every projective image apex of h is inherited, in the following cases:

(i) $\operatorname{rk} \mathcal{J}H \leq s+2$*;*

(ii) *H has an image apex and* $\operatorname{rk} \mathcal{J}H \leq s+3$*;*

(iii) *$\mathcal{J}H$ is symmetric and* $\operatorname{rk} \mathcal{J}H \leq 3$*;*

(iv) *H has an image apex, $\mathcal{J}H$ is symmetric and* $\operatorname{rk} \mathcal{J}H \leq 4$*.*

Proof. We will prove (iii) and (iv) in the section 8. We will not need them before section 8.

The proof of (i) and (ii) is similar to that of (i) and (ii) of proposition 5.3 respectively, but there are some points of attention. First of all, $M = N$ and $m = n$ because the dB-pairing must be symmetric. So we may assume by induction that $n = N - 1$.

The reduction to the case $N = \operatorname{rk} \mathcal{J}H + 2$ requires theorem 2.4. The same holds for the use of theorem 5.2 in (i) and (ii) if $k' \geq s+2$, where it may be necessary to replace H by $DH(DX)$, where D is an invertible diagonal matrix.

So the case $k' = s+1$ remains to be studied. If $\operatorname{trdeg}_K K(H|_{x_{s+1}=0}) = \operatorname{trdeg}_K K(H)$, then $h(x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_s, 0, x_{s+1}, x_{s+2}, \ldots, x_n)$ and H are symmetrically dB-paired, where h is as in the proof of proposition 5.3.

In the general case, it follows from theorem 2.4 that there are $c_{s+1}, c_N \in K$ such that

$$H(x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_s, c_{s+1}x_N, x_{s+2}, x_{s+3}, \ldots, x_n, c_N x_N)$$

and H are dB-paired. Now we replace H by $C^{\mathrm{t}}H(Cx)$, where $C \in \mathrm{GL}_N(K)$ such that

$$Cx = x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_s, x_{s+1} + c_{s+1}x_N, x_{s+2}, x_{s+3}, \ldots, x_n, c_N x_N$$

after which $\operatorname{trdeg}_K K(H|_{x_{s+1}=0}) = \operatorname{trdeg}_K K(H)$. This replacement will undo that $(H_{k'+1}, H_{k'+2}, \ldots, H_N)$ does not have a projective image apex, but restoring this property as in the proof of proposition 5.3 will not affect $\operatorname{trdeg}_K K(H|_{x_{s+1}=0}) = \operatorname{trdeg}_K K(H)$. But $k' = s+1$ does not need to hold any more. □

6 Hessians with small rank over gcd-domains

Lemma 6.1. *Let L be a field of characteristic zero and $h \in L[x]$. Let $r := \operatorname{rk} \mathcal{H}h$ and let s be the number of independent projective image apices of ∇h over L.*

(i) *Suppose that ∇h does not have an image apex. Then the following holds:*

- *$s \neq r$;*
- *If $r \leq 2$, then $r = 2$ and $s = 1$.*

(ii) *Suppose that ∇h does have an image apex. Then the following holds:*

- $s \neq r - 1$*;*
- *If* $s \neq r \leq 3$*, then* $r = 3$ *and* $s = 1$*.*

(iii) *Suppose that h is homogeneous. Then the following holds:*

- $s \neq r - 1$*;*
- *If* $s \neq r \leq 4$*, then* $r = 4$ *and* $s = 2$*.*

Proof. Let $H := \nabla h$. From proposition 1.2.9 of either [vdE] or [dB1], it follows that $r = \operatorname{trdeg}_L L(H)$.

On account of Lefschetz's principle, we may assume that $L \subseteq \mathbb{C}$. From theorem 4.7, it follows that there are only s independent projective image apices of H over $\mathbb{C}$ as well.

(i) From (1) $\Rightarrow$ (2) of corollary 3.9, it follows that $s < r$, which gives the first claim. To prove the second claim, suppose that $r \leq 2$. Since $0 \leq s < r$, it follows that $1 \leq r \leq 2$ and that it suffices to show that $s \geq 1$.

Now (i) of theorem 5.4 allows us to assume that $n = r + 1$. So $\operatorname{trdeg}_L L(H) = n - 1$. Define F as in lemma 4.6. Since $2 \leq n = r + 1 \leq 3$, it follows from [dB3, Prop. 2.1] and [dB3, Cor. 5.6 (i)] that there exists a nonzero $p \in K^n$ such that $p_1F_1 + p_2F_2 + \cdots + p_nF_n = 0$. On account of (3) $\Rightarrow$ (1) of lemma 4.6, p is a projective image apex of H. So $s \geq 1$.

(ii) From (2) $\Rightarrow$ (1) of corollary 3.9, it follows that $s \neq r - 1$, which is the first claim. To prove the second claim, suppose that $s \neq r \leq 3$. From (1) $\Rightarrow$ (2) of corollary 3.9, it follows that $s \leq r$, so $s \leq r - 2$. If $r \leq 2$, then it follows in a similar manner as in the proof of (i) that $s \geq 1$, which contradicts $s \leq r - 2 \leq 2 - 2 = 0$. So we may assume that $r = 3$ and $s \leq r - 2 = 1$, and it suffices to show that $s \geq 1$.

Take $g \in \mathbb{C}[y]$ of minimum degree, such that $g(H) = 0$. From [dB2, Th. 4.6], it follows that g can be expressed as a polynomial in 3 linear forms. There exist a $p \in L^4$ on which these 3 linear forms vanish, and a straightforward computation shows that $\mathcal{J}_y g \cdot p = 0$. So p is a projective image apex of H on account of (6) $\Rightarrow$ (1) of lemma 4.6. Hence $s \geq 1$.

(iii) If $\deg H < 1$, then $r = 0$ and it follows from (3) $\Rightarrow$ (2) of corollary 3.9 that $s = r = 0$, which gives both claims. So assume from now on that $\deg H \geq 1$. Since H is homogeneous of positive degree, it follows that $f(H) = 0$ implies $f(tH) = 0$, which is equivalent to $f\big((1 - t)H\big) = 0$. Hence the zero vector is an image apex of H, and the first claim follows from (ii).

To prove the second claim, suppose that $s \neq r \leq 4$. Just as in the proof of (ii), we have $s \leq r - 2$, so it suffices to show that $s \geq 2$. If $2 \leq r \leq 3$, then $s \geq 2$ follows in a similar manner as $s \geq 1$ follows in the case $1 \leq r \leq 2$ in (i), except that [dB3, Cor. 5.6 (ii)] is used instead of [dB3, Cor. 5.6 (i)]. So assume from now on that $r = 4$.

If $n = r + 1 = 5$, then $s \geq 2$ follows in a similar manner as $s \geq 1$ follows in the case $n = r + 1 = 4$ in (ii), except that [dB2, Th. 4.5] is used instead of [dB2, Th. 4.6]. So it suffices to reduce to the case $n = r + 1 = 5$.

Just like for M in the proof of proposition 5.3 and N in the proof of (i) and (ii) of theorem 5.4, theorem 5.1 allows us to assume that $n = r+2 = 6$ prior to the reduction to dimension $r + 1 = 5$. Take k and k' as in the proofs of proposition 5.3 and (i) and (ii) of theorem 5.4. The case $k' = s+1$ follows in a similar manner as in the proofs of proposition 5.3 and (i) and (ii) of theorem 5.4.

So assume that $k' \geq s+2$. The case $k \leq k'+1$ follows in a similar manner as in the proofs of (ii) of proposition 5.3 and (ii) of theorem 5.4. So assume that $k \geq k'+2 \geq s+4$. We will derive a contradiction with the minimality of k.

From theorem 2.6, it follows that there exists a $\tilde{h} \in K[x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4, x_5]$ such that

$$\tilde{H} := \Big(\frac{\partial}{\partial x_1}\tilde{h}, \frac{\partial}{\partial x_2}\tilde{h}, \frac{\partial}{\partial x_3}\tilde{h}, \frac{\partial}{\partial x_4}\tilde{h}, \frac{\partial}{\partial x_5}\tilde{h}\Big)$$

and H are dB-paired through matrices C^{t} and C, such that C has a left inverse. As we have seen above, $\tilde{H}$ has at least 2 independent projective image apices. Assume without loss of generality that e_1 and e_2 are projective image apices of $\tilde{H}$. From (iii) of proposition 3.8, it follows that

$$\operatorname{trdeg}_L L(\tilde{H}_3, \tilde{H}_4, \tilde{H}_5) = \operatorname{trdeg}_K K(\tilde{H}) - 2 = r - 2 = 2$$

So $\tilde{H}_3, \tilde{H}_4, \tilde{H}_5$ are algebraically dependent over L. From proposition 2.2, it follows that $(C^{\mathrm{t}})_3 H, (C^{\mathrm{t}})_4 H, (C^{\mathrm{t}})_5 H$ are algebraically dependent over L as well. Since the rows of C^{t} are independent over K, we can deduce that $k - s \leq 3$. This contradicts $k \geq s + 4$. □

Theorem 6.2. *Let R be an integral domain of characteristic zero, with fraction field L. Assume that $H \in R[x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_m]^m$, such that $\mathcal{J}R$ is symmetric. On account of Poincaré's lemma or* [vdE, Lem. 1.3.53]*, there exists an $h \in R[x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_m]$ such that $H_i = \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} h$ for each i.*

Write $r := \operatorname{rk} \mathcal{J}H$.

(i) *If $r = 0$, then h has an image apex over L which is contained in R^m, say b, and h is of the form*

$$h = g + b_1 x_1 + b_2 x_2 + \cdots + b_m x_m$$

where $g \in R$.

Furthermore, $\{b\}$ is both the Zariski closure of the image of H and the set of image apices over L of H, and

$$f(H) = 0 \Longleftrightarrow f\big((1-t)H + tb\big) = 0 \Longleftrightarrow f(b) = 0$$

for every $f \in L[y]$.

(ii) *If $r \leq 1$ and R is a* gcd*-domain, then h has an image apex over L which is contained in R^m, say b, and h is of the form*

$$h = g(p_1x_1 + p_2x_2 + \cdots + p_mx_m) + b_1x_1 + b_2x_2 + \cdots + b_mx_m$$

where $g \in R[t]$ and $p \in R^m$, such that $r = \mathrm{rk}(p)$.

Furthermore, $\{b + \lambda p \,|\, \lambda \in L\}$ is both the Zariski closure of the image of H and the set of image apices of over L of H, and

$$f(H) = 0 \iff f\big(tp + (1-u)H + ub\big) = 0 \iff f(tp + b) = 0$$

for every $f \in L[y]$.

(iii) *Suppose that $b \in R^m$ is an image apex of H over L. If $r \leq 2$ and R is a Bézout domain, then h is of the form*

$$h = g(p_1x_1 + p_2x_2 + \cdots + p_mx_m, q_1x_1 + q_2x_2 + \cdots + q_mx_m) + b_1x_1 + b_2x_2 + \cdots + b_mx_m$$

where $g \in R[t,u]$, $p \in R^m$ and $q \in R^m$, such that $r = \mathrm{rk}(p|q)$.

Furthermore, $\{b + \lambda p + \mu q \,|\, \lambda, \mu \in L\}$ is both the Zariski closure of the image of H and the set of image apices over L of H, and

$$f(H) = 0 \iff f\big(tp + uq + (1-v)H + vb\big) = 0 \iff f(tp + uq + b) = 0$$

for every $f \in L[y]$, where v is a variable.

Proof. Let s be the number of independent projective image apices of H over L. From (i) of lemma 6.1, it follows that H has an image apex over L if $r \leq 1$. So we may assume that H has an image apex over L. From (ii) of lemma 6.1, if follows that $s = r$ if $r \leq 2$ and H has an image apex over L. So we may assume that $s = r$ as well. In particular, (1) of corollary 3.9 is satisfied.

On account of corollary 3.9, $H(0)$ is an image apex of H over L, which is contained in R^m. So H has an image apex b over L, which is contained in R^m. From (i) of proposition 3.1, it follows that the origin is an image apex of $H - b$ over L. So if the origin is not an image apex of H over L, then we can alter that by replacing H by $H - b$. So we may assume that the origin is an image apex of H over L.

We assume from now on that $R = L$. The general case reduces to this case by way of lemma 6.3 below, because we can take $b = 0$ on account of the assumption that the origin is an image apex of H over L.

There exists a $Q \in \mathrm{GL}_m(L)$ such that the first s columns $Qe_1, Qe_2, \ldots, Qe_s$ of Q are projective image apices of H. Let p be the first column of Q if $r = s \geq 1$ and let q be the second column of Q if $r = s \geq 2$. We can write h in the form $h = \tilde{h}(Q^{\mathrm{t}}x)$, so $H = Q\tilde{H}(Q^{\mathrm{t}}x)$, where $\tilde{H} = \nabla\tilde{h}$.

Since $\tilde{H}$ and H are dB-paired through Q^{-1} and $(Q^{-1})^{\mathrm{t}}$, it follows from (ii) of proposition 4.1 that $e_1, e_2, \ldots, e_s$ are projective image apices of $\tilde{H}$. From (iii)

of proposition 3.8, it follows that $\operatorname{trdeg}_L L(\tilde{H}_{s+1}, \tilde{H}_{s+2}, \ldots, \tilde{H}_m) = 0$, so $\tilde{H}_i \in L$ for all $i > s$.

Suppose that $\tilde{H}_i \neq 0$ for some $i > s$. Then t is algebraically dependent of the i-th component of $(1-t)\tilde{H}$. From (i) of proposition 3.2, it follows that the origin is not an image apex of $\tilde{H}$, which contradicts (i) of proposition 4.1. So $\tilde{H}_i = 0$ for all $i > s$. Hence $\tilde{h} \in L[x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_s]$ and

$$h \in L[(Q^{\mathrm{t}}x)_1, (Q^{\mathrm{t}}x)_2, \ldots, (Q^{\mathrm{t}}x)_s] = L[x^{\mathrm{t}}Qe_1, x^{\mathrm{t}}Qe_2, \ldots, x^{\mathrm{t}}Qe_s]$$

So h is as given.

Let W be the Zariski closure of the image of H. From (1) $\Rightarrow$ (3) of corollary 3.9, it follows that W is an affine plane of dimension s. Using (iii) and (iv) of corollary 3.5, we deduce that

$$f(H) = 0 \Longrightarrow f\big((1-t)H + y_1Qe_1 + y_2Qe_2 + \cdots + y_sQe_s\big) = 0 \tag{6.1}$$

for every $f \in [y]$.

Take $c \in L^s$ arbitrary. If we substitute $t = 1$ and $y_i = c_i$ for each $i \leq s$ in (6.1), then we see that W contains the linear span of $Qe_1, Qe_2, \ldots, Qe_s$. Comparing dimensions, we deduce that W is equal to this linear span. If we substitute $y_i = tc_i$ for each $i \leq s$ in (6.1), then we see that every point of z is an image apex of H. The converse follows by substituting $t = 0$ in the definition of image apex. □

Lemma 6.3. *Let R be an integral domain with fraction field L, and $h \in R[x]$. Suppose that $p, q \in L^n$.*

(i) *If $h \in L$, then $h \in R$.*

(ii) *If $h \in L[p^{\mathrm{t}}x]$ and R is a* gcd*-domain, then $h \in R[\tilde{p}^{\mathrm{t}}x]$ for some $\tilde{p} \in R^n$ which is dependent over L of p.*

(iii) *If $h \in L[p^{\mathrm{t}}x, q^{\mathrm{t}}x]$ and $p, q \in L \cdot S^n$ for a Bézout subdomain S of R, then $h \in R[\tilde{p}^{\mathrm{t}}x, \tilde{q}^{\mathrm{t}}x]$ for some $\tilde{p}, \tilde{q} \in S^n$ which are dependent over L of p and q.*

(iv) *If $h \in L[p^{\mathrm{t}}x, q^{\mathrm{t}}x]$, R is a* gcd*-domain and there exists an i such that $\tilde{p} := p_i^{-1}p \in R^n$, then $h \in R[\tilde{p}^{\mathrm{t}}x, \tilde{q}^{\mathrm{t}}x]$ and $\tilde{q}_i = 0$ for some $\tilde{q} \in K^n$ which is dependent over L of p and q.*

Proof.

(i) Suppose that $h \in L$. Then $h \in R[x] \cap L = R$.

(ii) Suppose that $h \in L[p^{\mathrm{t}}x]$ and that R is a gcd-domain. Then there exists a $\tilde{p} \in R^n$ which is dependent over L of p, such that $\gcd\{\tilde{p}_1, \tilde{p}_2, \ldots, \tilde{p}_n\} = 1$. Since every homogeneous part of h is contained in $R[x]$ and an L-multiple of a power of $\tilde{p}^{\mathrm{t}}x$, it follows from Gauss's lemma that $h \in R[\tilde{p}^{\mathrm{t}}x]$.

(iii) Suppose that $h \in L[p^{\mathrm{t}}x, q^{\mathrm{t}}x]$ and that $p, q \in L \cdot S^n$ for a Bézout subdomain S of R. Then the column space of $P := (p|q)$ is generated by column vectors over S.

From lemma 6.4 below, it follows that $P = Q \cdot B$ for some $B \in \mathrm{Mat}_2(L)$ and a $Q \in \mathrm{Mat}_{n,2}(R)$ which is left invertible. If we define $(\tilde{p}|\tilde{q}) := Q$, then $h \in L[\tilde{p}^{\mathrm{t}}x, \tilde{q}^{\mathrm{t}}x]$, say that $h = f(\tilde{p}^{\mathrm{t}}x, \tilde{q}^{\mathrm{t}}x)$, where $f \in L[t, u]$.

Let $C \in \mathrm{Mat}_{n,2}(R)$ be a left inverse of Q. Then

$$h(C^{\mathrm{t}}(t,u)) \in R[C^{\mathrm{t}}(t,u)] \subseteq R[t,u]$$

Since

$$h\big(C^{\mathrm{t}}(t,u)\big) = f\big(\tilde{p}^{\mathrm{t}} \cdot C^{\mathrm{t}}(t,u), \tilde{q} \cdot C^{\mathrm{t}}(t,u)\big) = f\big(Q^{\mathrm{t}}C^{\mathrm{t}}(t,u)\big)$$

and $Q^{\mathrm{t}}C^{\mathrm{t}} = (CQ)^{\mathrm{t}} = I_2^{\mathrm{t}} = I_2$, we conclude that $f \in R[t,u]$.

(iv) Suppose that $h \in L[p^{\mathrm{t}}x, q^{\mathrm{t}}x]$, that R is a gcd-domain and that there exists an i such that $\tilde{p} := p_i^{-1}p \in R^n$. If p and q are dependent over L, then q is redundant and the result follows from (i), because $\tilde{p}_i = 1$. So assume that p and q are independent over L. Let $\tilde{q}$ be the L-multiple of $q - q_i\tilde{p}$ from which the coefficients are relatively prime. Then $\tilde{q}_i = 0$ because $q_i - q_i\tilde{p}_i = 0$.

It is clear that $h \in L[\tilde{p}^{\mathrm{t}}x, \tilde{q}^{\mathrm{t}}x]$, say that $h = f(\tilde{p}^{\mathrm{t}}x, \tilde{q}^{\mathrm{t}}x)$, where $f \in L[y_1, y_2]$. Then $f(x_i, \tilde{q}^{\mathrm{t}}x) = h|_{x_i = 2x_i - \tilde{p}^{\mathrm{t}}x} \in R[x]$. Now apply the proof of (i) on the coefficient of x_i^k of $f(x_i, \tilde{q}^{\mathrm{t}}x)$ for each k to obtain that $f \in R[y_1, y_2]$. So $h \in R[\tilde{p}^{\mathrm{t}}x, \tilde{q}^{\mathrm{t}}x]$. □

Lemma 6.4. *Let S be a Bézout domain which is contained in a field L, and $P \in \mathrm{Mat}_{m,n}(S)$. If $r \geq \operatorname{rk} P > 0$, then there exists a $Q \in \mathrm{Mat}_{m,r}(S)$ which is left invertible over S, such that $P = QA$ for some $A \in \mathrm{Mat}_{r,n}(S)$.*

Proof. The idea of the proof is to transform P to Q by way of column operations. We start by taking

$$Q_{(0)} = \Big(P \,\Big|\, * \Big) A_{(0)} = \begin{pmatrix} I_n \\ \emptyset \end{pmatrix}$$

in such a way that $\operatorname{rk} Q_{(0)} = r$ and the product $Q_{(0)} \cdot A_{(0)}$ makes sense. Thus $Q_{(0)} \cdot A_{(0)} = P$. Next, we do the following for $i = 1, 2, \ldots, r$, in that order.

Assume by induction that $\operatorname{rk} Q_{(i-1)} = r$ and $Q_{(i-1)} \cdot A_{(i-1)} = P$. Since $i \leq r = \operatorname{rk} Q_{(i-1)}$, it follows that there exists a $j \geq i$ such that the j-th column q of $Q_{(i-1)}$ is nonzero. Choose j as small as possible. Make $P_{(i)} \in \mathrm{Mat}_{m,}(S)$ from $Q_{(i-1)}$ by dividing column j by $\gcd\{q\}$ and removing columns $i, i+1, \ldots, j-1$, which are all zero by definition of j. To obtain that $P_{(i)}B_{(i)} = P$, make $B_{(i)} \in \mathrm{Mat}_{,n}(L)$ from $A_{(i-1)}$ by multiplying row j by $\gcd\{q\}$ and removing rows $i, i+1, \ldots, j-1$.

Assume by induction that there exists a $C \in \mathrm{Mat}_{i-1,m}(S)$ such that $C \cdot Q_{(i-1)} = \big(I_{i-1}\big|\emptyset\big)$. Then Then $C \cdot P_{(i)} = \big(I_{i-1}\big|\emptyset\big)$ as well. Let p be the i-th

column of $P_{(i)}$. By definition of $P_{(i)}$, $\gcd\{p\} = 1$. On account of the Bézout property of S, there exists a $c \in S^m$ such that $c^{\mathrm{t}} p = 1$.

Define $d = c^{\mathrm{t}} P_{(i)}$. Make $Q_{(i)} \in \mathrm{Mat}_{m,}(S)$ from $P_{(i)}$ by subtracting the i-th column p of $P_{(i)}$ d_k times from the k-th column of $P_{(i)}$, for every $k \neq i$. This results in that $c^{\mathrm{t}} Q_{(i)} = e_i^{\mathrm{t}}$, and that Since $C \cdot Q_{(i)} = \big(I_{i-1} \big| \emptyset\big)$ just like $C \cdot P_{(i)} = \big(I_{i-1} \big| \emptyset\big)$. Hence

$$\begin{pmatrix} C \\ c^{\mathrm{t}} \end{pmatrix} \cdot Q^{(i)} = \big(I_i \big| \emptyset\big)$$

To obtain that $A_{(i)} Q_{(i)} = P$, make $A_{(i)} \in \mathrm{Mat}_{,n}(L)$ from $B_{(i)}$ by adding the i-th row of $B_{(i)}$ d_k times to the k-th row of $B_{(i)}$, for every $k \neq i$.

Finally, we end with matrices $Q_{(r)} \in \mathrm{Mat}_{m,}(L)$ and $A_{(r)} \in \mathrm{Mat}_{,n}(L)$ such that

$$Q_{(r)} A_{(r)} = P \qquad \text{and} \qquad C Q_{(r)} = \big(I_r \big| \emptyset\big)$$

for some $C \in \mathrm{Mat}_{r,m}(S)$. If there exists a $j > r$ such that the j-th row of $Q_{(r)}$ is nonzero, then there exists a $Q_{(r+1)} \in \mathrm{Mat}_{m,}(L)$ and a $c \in S^m$ such that

$$\mathrm{rk}\, Q_{(r+1)} = \mathrm{rk}\, Q_{(r)} = r \qquad \text{and} \qquad \begin{matrix} C \\ c^{\mathrm{t}} \end{matrix} \cdot Q^{(r+1)} = \big(I_{r+1} \big| \emptyset\big)$$

which contradicts $\mathrm{rk}\,\big(\tilde{C} \cdot Q_{(r+1)}\big) \leq \mathrm{rk}\, Q_{(r+1)}$.

So $Q_{(r)}$ is totally zero below row r. Make Q from $Q_{(r)}$ by removing columns $r+1, r+2, \ldots$ and make A from $A_{(r)}$ by removing rows $r+1, r+2, \ldots$. Then $QA = P$ and $CQ = I_r$, as desired. □

Corollary 6.5. *Let $S = K[t]$, $L = K(t)$ and $P \in \mathrm{Mat}_{m,n}(S)$. If $r \geq \mathrm{rk}\, P > 0$, then there exists matrices Q and A as in lemma 6.4, such that in addition, one of the following statements hold.*

(i) *A is upper triangular, i.e. A can be obtained by removing the last $n - r$ rows of a square lower triangular matrix.*

(ii) *The leading homogeneous parts of the columns of Q are independent over L. In other words, the matrix $\hat{Q} \in \mathrm{Mat}_{m,n}(K)$, which is defined by that $\hat{Q} e_i$ is the column of the coefficients of $t^{\deg(Q e_i)}$ of Q_i, has rank r.*

Proof. Since $K[t]$ is a Bézout domain, we can find matrices Q and A as in lemma 6.4.

(i) In the proof of lemma 6.4, we can choose c such that $c^{\mathrm{t}}(Q_{(i)})_k = 0$ for all $k < i$, namely by subtracting multiples of the rows of C from c^{t}. Hence one can show by induction that for all i, $A_{(i)}$ and $B_{(i)}$ are zero below the diagonal which starts at the upper left corner. So A is as claimed.

(ii) Assume without loss of generality that

$$\deg(Q e_1) \leq \deg(Q e_2) \leq \cdots \leq \deg(Q e_r)$$

Suppose that the leading homogeneous parts of the columns of Q are dependent over L. Then there exists an i such that $\hat{Q}e_i$ is dependent over K of $\hat{Q}e_1, \hat{Q}e_2, \ldots, \hat{Q}e_{i-1}$, say that $\hat{Q}e_i = c_1\hat{Q}e_1 + c_2\hat{Q}e_2 + \cdots + c_{i-1}\hat{Q}e_{i-1}$.

Now replace Q by

$$Q - \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} c_j t^{\deg(Qe_i)-\deg(Qe_j)}\hat{Q}e_j$$

Then Q is replaced by QU for an upper diagonal $U \in \mathrm{Mat}_r(S)$ with ones on the diagonal. So $U \in \mathrm{GL}_r(S)$ and we can replace A by $U^{-1}A$ to preserve $P = QA$. Similarly, it follows that Q remains left invertible over S.

By induction on $\deg Qe_1 + \deg Qe_2 + \cdots + \deg Qe_r$, it follows that we can get A and Q as claimed after repeating the above several times. □

The statement of lemma 6.4 is a weak version of a result from 1861 by Henri John Stephen Smith in [Smi], which adds to lemma 6.4 that A is the product of a square diagonal matrix over S and a right invertible matrix over S (in this order), such that the diagonal entries of S are ordered by divisibility. But Smith assumed the ring S to be noetherian, i.e. a principal ideal domain. However, there exist Bézout domains for which Smith's result is valid, see [Kap].

The matrix decomposition of Smith, which is called Smith normal form, is symmetric in some sense. This is not the case for the matrix decomposition of lemma 6.4. For that reason, the de Bondt normal form of a matrix M, which is defined in the scope of this paragraph, adds to the matrix decomposition of lemma 6.4 that A is the product of a left-invertible matrix over S and a square matrix of rank $\mathrm{rk}\, P$ over S. The de Bondt normal form can be obtained by applying lemma 6.4 another time on the transpose of the matrix A from the first application.

7 Hessians with small rank over polynomial rings

Definition 7.1. Let K be a field and R be an integral K-domain. Let L be the fraction field of R. We call R *Bogal* if one of the following statements is satisfied.

- R is a Bézout domain.
- R is a gcd-domain and L satisfies Lüroth's theorem as an extension field of K.

Here, Bogal stands for 'Bézout or gcd and Lüroth'.

Theorem 7.2 (Main theorem)**.** *Let K be a field of characteristic zero. Assume that R is an integral K-domain. Let L be the fraction field of R and suppose that K is algebraically closed in L.*

Assume that $H \in R[x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_m]^m$, such that $\mathcal{J}R$ is symmetric. On account of Poincaré's lemma or [vdE, Lem. 1.3.53]*, there exists an $h \in R[x_1, x_2,$*

$\ldots, x_m]$ *such that* $H = \nabla h$. *Suppose that* H *does* not *have a projective image apex* $p^{(1)} \in K^m$ *over* K.

(i) *Suppose that* $\operatorname{trdeg}_K K(H) = 0$. *Then* H does *have an image apex* $a \in K^m$ *over* K, *and* h *is of the form*

$$h = g + a_1x_1 + a_2x_2 + \cdots + a_mx_m$$

where $g \in R$. *Furthermore,* $H = a$.

(ii) *Suppose that* $\operatorname{trdeg}_K K(H) = 1$. *Then* H *does* not *have an image apex* $a \in K^m$ *over* K, *and* h *is of the form*

$$h = g + b_1x_1 + b_2x_2 + \cdots + b_mx_m$$

where $g \in R$ *and* $b \in R^m \setminus K^m$. *Furthermore,* $H = b$.

(iii) *Suppose that* $\operatorname{trdeg}_K K(H) = 2$ *and that* H does *have an image apex* $a \in K^m$ *over* K. *If* R *is a* gcd*-domain, then* h *is of the form*

$$h = g(p_1x_1 + p_2x_2 + \cdots + p_mx_m) + a_1x_1 + a_2x_2 + \cdots + a_mx_m$$

where $g \in R[t] \setminus R$ *and* $p \in R^m \setminus R \cdot K^m$, *such that*

$$\operatorname{trdeg}_{K(\gamma)} K(\gamma)(tp) = 1$$

for some $\gamma \in L$. *Furthermore,* $f(H) = 0 \iff f(tp + a) = 0$ *for all* $f \in K[y]$.

(iv) *Suppose that* $\operatorname{trdeg}_K K(H) = 2$ *and that* H *does* not *have an image apex* $a \in K^m$ *over* K. *If* R *is a* gcd*-domain, then* h *is of the form*

$$h = g(p_1x_1 + p_2x_2 + \cdots + p_mx_m) + b_1x_1 + b_2x_2 + \cdots + b_mx_m$$

where $g \in R[t]$ *and* $p, b \in R^m$, *such that* $\deg b \geq 1$. *In addition,*

$$\operatorname{trdeg}_{K(\gamma)} K(\gamma)(tp) + \operatorname{trdeg}_{K(\gamma)} K(\gamma)(b - \lambda p) = 1$$

for some $\gamma, \lambda \in L$. *Furthermore,* $f(H) = 0 \iff f(tp + b) = 0$ *for all* $f \in K[y]$.

If it is possible to take $p \in K^m$, *then we can take* $g \in R$ *and* $p = 0$. *In other words,* h *is as in* (ii) *in that case.*

(v) *Suppose that* $\operatorname{trdeg}_K K(H) = 3$ *and that* H does *have an image apex* $a \in K^m$ *over* K. *If* R *is a Bogal domain, then* h *is of the form*

$$h = g(p_1x_1 + p_2x_2 + \cdots + p_mx_m, q_1x_1 + q_2x_2 + \cdots + q_mx_m) + a_1x_1 + a_2x_2 + \cdots + a_mx_m$$

where $g \in R[t,u]$ and $p,q \in R^m$ for each i. In addition, if $R = L$ or L satisfies Lüroth's theorem as an extension field of K, then

$$\operatorname{trdeg}_{K(\gamma)} K(\gamma)(tp) + \operatorname{trdeg}_{K(\gamma)} K(\gamma)(uq) = 2$$

for some $\gamma \in L$. Furthermore, $f(H) = 0 \iff f(tp + uq + a) = 0$ for all $f \in K[y]$.

If it is possible to arrange that some nontrivial L-linear combination of p and q is contained in K^m, then we can take $g \in R[t] \setminus R$ and $q = 0$. In other words, H is as in (iii) *in that case, except that* $\operatorname{trdeg}_{K(\gamma)} K(\gamma)(tp) = 2$ *instead of* $\operatorname{trdeg}_{K(\gamma)} K(\gamma)(tp) = 1$.

If R is a polynomial ring, then $\deg b \geq 2$ *in* (ii) *and in the case $p = 0$ of (iv), and* $\deg p \geq 2$ *in* (iii) *and in the case $q = 0$ of (v).*

Corollary 7.3. *Let K be a field of characteristic zero and $h \in K[x]$. Let $r := \operatorname{rk} \mathcal{H}h$ and let s be the number of independent projective image apices of ∇h. Let $m := n - s$ and assume without loss of generality that $e_{m+1}, e_{m+2}, \ldots, e_n$ are s independent projective image apices of ∇h.*

Define $R := K[x_{m+1}, x_{m+2}, \ldots, x_n]$.

(i) *Suppose that ∇h does not have an image apex.*

- *If $r \leq 2$, then $r = 2$, h is of the form of* (ii) *of theorem 7.2 and $s = 1$.*
- *If $r = 3$ and $s \geq 1$, then h is of the form of* (ii) *or* (iv) *of theorem 7.2 and $s = 2$ or $s = 1$ respectively.*

(ii) *Suppose that ∇h does have an image apex.*

- *If $r \leq 2$, then h is of the form of* (i) *of theorem 7.2 and $s = r$.*
- *If $r = 3$, then h is of the form of* (i) *or* (iii) *of theorem 7.2 and $s = 3$ or $s = 1$ respectively.*
- *If $r = 4$ and $s \geq 1$, then h is of the form of* (i), (iii) *or* (v) *of theorem 7.2 and $s = 4$, $s = 2$ or $s = 1$ respectively.*

(iii) *Suppose that h is homogeneous. If $r \geq 1$, then the zero vector is an image apex of ∇h.*

- *If $1 \leq r \leq 3$, then h is of the form of* (i) *of theorem 7.2 with $a_i = 0$ for all i and $s = r$.*
- *If $r = 4$, then h is of the form of* (i) *or* (iii) *of theorem 7.2 with $a_i = 0$ for all i and $s = 4$ or $s = 2$ respectively.*

Proof. Notice that R is both a gcd-domain and a Bogal domain (but not necessarily a Bézout domain). Let $H = \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x_1}h, \frac{\partial}{\partial x_2}h, \ldots, \frac{\partial}{\partial x_m}h\right)$. From proposition 1.2.9 of either [vdE], it follows that $r = \operatorname{trdeg}_K K(\nabla h)$.

From (ii) of proposition 3.8, it follows that H does not have a projective image apex $p \in K^m$ over K. From (i) of proposition 3.8, it follows that ∇h has an image apex $a \in K^n$ over K, if and only if H has an image apex $a \in K^m$ over K. From (iii) of proposition 3.8, it follows that $\operatorname{trdeg}_K K(H) = r - s$. Hence the results follow from lemma 6.1 and theorem 7.2 □

Proof of (i) *of theorem 7.2.* As $\operatorname{trdeg}_K K(H) = 0$ and K is algebraically closed in L, it follows that $H \in K^m$. So if we take $a := H$, then it is straightforward to verify that (i) is satisfied. □

Proof of (ii) *of theorem 7.2.* We first show that $\operatorname{trdeg}_L L(H) = 0$. So assume that $\operatorname{trdeg}_L L(H) \geq 1$. From (i) and (ii) of lemma 6.1, we deduce that $\operatorname{trdeg}_L L(H) \geq 3$ if H does not have a projective image apex $p \in L^m$ over L. Since

$$\operatorname{trdeg}_L L(H) \leq \operatorname{trdeg}_K K(H) = 1 \leq 2$$

we conclude that H does have a projective image apex over L. From (i) of theorem 4.9, it follows that $\operatorname{trdeg}_L L(H) \leq \operatorname{trdeg}_K K(H) - 1 = 0$.

So $\operatorname{trdeg}_L L(H) = 0$ indeed. On account of (i) of theorem 6.2, h is of the form

$$h = g + b_1 x_1 + b_2 x_2 + \cdots + b_m x_m$$

where $g \in R$ and $b \in R^m$ is any image apex of H over L which is contained in R^m. Since $\operatorname{trdeg}_K K(H) = 1$, it follows that $b = H \notin K^m$.

So it remains to show the first claim of (ii). Hence suppose that H does have an image apex $a \in K^m$ over K. Since $\operatorname{trdeg}_L L(H) > -1 = \operatorname{trdeg}_K K(H) - 2$, it follows from (iii) of theorem 4.9 that a is an image apex of H over L. Hence we can take $b = a$. This contradicts $b = H \notin K^m$, so H does not have an image apex $a \in K^m$ over K. □

Lemma 7.4. *Let L be an extension field of a field K of characteristic zero, such that K is algebraically closed in L. Suppose that $P \in \operatorname{Mat}_{m,n}(L)$ and $b \in L^m$, such that $r := \operatorname{rk} P > 0$.*

Then there exists a $Q \in \operatorname{Mat}_{m,r}(L)$, an $A \in \operatorname{Mat}_{r,n}(L)$, and a $\lambda \in L^m$, such that

$$P = Q \cdot A$$

and such that the following holds, where

$$a := b - P\lambda$$

and $z = (z_1, z_2, \ldots, z_r)$.

(i) $\operatorname{trdeg}_K K(Qz + a) = \operatorname{trdeg}_K K(Py + b)$

(ii) $\operatorname{trdeg}_K K(a) \leq \operatorname{trdeg}_K K(Qz + a) - r$ *and* $\operatorname{trdeg}_K K(Qe_i) \leq \operatorname{trdeg}_K K(Qz + a) - r$ *for all i.*

(iii) *If* $\operatorname{trdeg}_K K(Py + b) \leq r$, *then* $\operatorname{trdeg}_K K(Qz + a) = r$ *and*

$$(Q|a) \in \operatorname{Mat}_{m,r+1}(K)$$

(iv) *If* $\operatorname{trdeg}_K K(Py + b) = r + 1$, *then either*

$$(Q|a) \in \operatorname{Mat}_{m,r+1}(\tilde{K})$$

for an extension field $\tilde{K}$ *of* K *for which* $\operatorname{trdeg}_K \tilde{K} = 1$ *and* $\tilde{K} \subseteq L$*, or*

$$(Q|a) - p^{(1)}\big(b^{(1)}\big)^{\mathrm{t}} \in \mathrm{Mat}_{m,r+1}(K)$$

for a $p^{(1)} \in K^m$ *and a* $b^{(1)} \in L^r \setminus K^r$*.*

Proof. Assume without loss of generality that the leading principal minor matrix M of size r of P has rank r. Take for A the matrix consisting of the first r rows of P. Take for Q the product of the matrix consisting of the first r columns of P and M^{-1}. Then the leading principal minor matrix of size r of Q is the identity matrix. From $\operatorname{rk} M = \operatorname{rk} P$, it follows that the reduced column echelon form of P is of the form $(Q|\emptyset)$. Since the first r rows of $Q \cdot A$ are equal to those of P in addition, we can deduce that $P = Q \cdot A$ as a whole.

Define $\beta \in L^r$ by $\beta_i = b_i$ for all $i \leq r$ and let $\lambda = (M^{-1}\beta, 0^{r+1}, 0^{r+2}, \ldots, 0^n)$. By definition of Q,

$$a = b - P\lambda = b - Q\beta$$

Since the leading principal minor of Q equals I_r, it follows that $a_1 = a_2 = \cdots = a_r = 0$.

(i) Notice that

$$\operatorname{trdeg}_K K\big(Py + b\big) = \operatorname{trdeg}_K K\big(P(y - \lambda) + b\big) = \operatorname{trdeg}_K K\big(Py + a\big)$$

Since M is the matrix of the first r columns of A, it follows that A is right invertible. Hence

$$\operatorname{trdeg}_K K\big(Qz + a\big) = \operatorname{trdeg}_K K\big(Q(Ay) + a\big) = \operatorname{trdeg}_K K\big(Py + a\big)$$

So $\operatorname{trdeg}_K K\big(Py + b\big) = \operatorname{trdeg}_K K\big(Qz + a\big)$.

(ii) Let $j \leq r$. Take $\mathfrak{p} := \big(f \in K[y] \,\big|\, f(Qz + a) = 0\big)$ and $\mathfrak{q} := \big(f \in K[y] \,\big|\, f(Qz|_{z_j=0} + a) = 0\big)$. Then $\mathfrak{p} \subseteq \mathfrak{q}$. As $\mathfrak{p} \not\ni y_j \in \mathfrak{q}$, it follows that $\mathfrak{p} \subsetneq \mathfrak{q}$. So

$$\operatorname{trdeg}_K K\big(Qz|_{z_j=0} + a\big) \leq \operatorname{trdeg}_K K(Qz + a) - 1$$

Since $Q_j = e_j^{\mathrm{t}}$ and $a_j = 0$ for all $j \leq r$, the substitution $z_j = 0$ comes down to removing the j-th row and j-th column of $(Q|a)$. Hence it follows by induction on r that

$$\operatorname{trdeg}_K K(Qz|_{z=0} + a) \leq \operatorname{trdeg}_K K(Qz + a) - r$$

and that for all i,

$$\operatorname{trdeg}_K K(Qz|_{z=z_i e_i} + a) \leq \operatorname{trdeg}_K K(Qz + a) - (r - 1)$$

So $\operatorname{trdeg}_K K(a) \leq \operatorname{trdeg}_K K(Qz + a) - r$ has been proved.

Hence it remains to show that $\operatorname{trdeg}_K K(Qe_i) \leq \operatorname{trdeg}_K K(Qz+a) - r$. Let $s := \operatorname{trdeg}_K K(Qz+a)$ and suppose that

$$\operatorname{trdeg}_K K(Qe_i) > \operatorname{trdeg}_K K(Qz+a) - r = s - r$$

Since the first r coordinates of Qe_i are contained in K, we may assume without loss of generality that $Q_{(r+1)i}, Q_{(r+2)i}, \ldots, Q_{(r+s)i}, Q_{(r+s+1)i}$ are algebraically independent over K.

Since $\operatorname{trdeg}_K K(Qe_iz_i+a) \leq \operatorname{trdeg}_K K(Qz+a) - (r-1) = s+1-r$, it follows that there exists a nonzero $f \in K[y_i, y_{r+1}, y_{r+2}, \ldots, y_{r+s}, y_{r+s+1}]$ such that $f(Qe_iz_i+a) = 0$. Looking at the coefficient of $z_i^{\deg f}$, we see that there exist a homogeneous polynomial g over K such that

$$g\big(1, Q_{(r+1)i}, Q_{(r+2)i}, \ldots, Q_{(r+s)}i\big) = 0$$

This contradicts that $Q_{(r+1)i}, Q_{(r+2)i}, \ldots, Q_{(r+s)i}, Q_{(r+s+1)i}$ are algebraically independent over K.

(iii) Assume that $\operatorname{trdeg}_K K(Qz+a) \leq r$. From (ii), it follows that

$$\operatorname{trdeg}_K K(a) \leq \operatorname{trdeg}_K K(Qz+a) - r \leq 0$$

Consequently, $\operatorname{trdeg}_K K(a) = 0$ and $\operatorname{trdeg}_K K(Qz+a) = r$. Similarly, $\operatorname{trdeg}_K K(Qe_i) = 0$ for all i. Now (iii) follows, because K is algebraically closed in L.

(iv) The case where $Q \in \operatorname{Mat}_{m,r}(K)$ follows from (ii), so assume the opposite. Assume without loss of generality that $Q_{(r+1)1} \notin K$. If $Q_{(r+2)1}$ is linearly dependent over K of $Q_{(r+1)1}$ and Q_{11}, the we can clean it by row operations over K in $(Q|a)$. Since such row operations do not affect the claim of (iv), we may assume that either $Q_{(r+2)1} = 0$ or $Q_{(r+2)1}$ is linearly independent over K of $Q_{(r+1)1}$ and Q_{11}.

Since $Q_{11} = 1$, $Q_{(r+1)1} \notin K$ and K is algebraically closed in L, it follows that $\operatorname{trdeg}_K K(Q_{11}, Q_{(r+1)1}) = 1$. From (ii) with $m = r+1$ and $i = 1$, we deduce that the first $r+1$ components of $Qz+a$ are algebraically independent over K.

Suppose that $\operatorname{trdeg}_K K(Qz+a) = r+1$. Then the first $r+1$ components of $Qz+a$ are a transcendence basis over K of $K(Qz+a)$ and there exists a nonzero $f \in K[y_1, y_2, \ldots, y_r, y_{r+1}, y_{r+2}]$, such that $f(Qz+a) = 0$. Take f as such of minimum degree and define

$$g := \sum_{i=1}^{m} Q_{i1} \frac{\partial}{\partial y_i} f = \frac{\partial}{\partial y_1} f + Q_{(r+1)1} \frac{\partial}{\partial y_{r+1}} f + Q_{(r+2)1} \frac{\partial}{\partial y_{r+2}} f$$

Then

$$g(Qz+a) = \frac{\partial}{\partial z_1} f(Qz+a) = 0$$

We distinguish two cases.

- $g \neq 0$.
  Let $\tilde{K}$ be the algebraic closure of $K(Qe_1)$ in L. Then $g \in \tilde{K}[y]$ and $\tilde{K}$ is algebraically closed in L. Furthermore, it follow from (ii) and (i) that

  $$\operatorname{trdeg}_K \tilde{K} \leq \operatorname{trdeg}_K K(Qz+a) - r = \operatorname{trdeg}_K K(Pz+b) - r \leq 1$$

  If $\operatorname{trdeg}_{\tilde{K}} \tilde{K}(Qz+a) \leq r$, then it follows from (iii) that $Q \in \operatorname{Mat}_{m,r}(\tilde{K})$ and $a \in \tilde{K}^m$, which gives (iv).
  In order to show that $\operatorname{trdeg}_{\tilde{K}} \tilde{K}(Qz+a) \leq r$, suppose that $\operatorname{trdeg}_{\tilde{K}} \tilde{K}(Qz+a) \geq r+1$. Then

  $$\mathfrak{p} := \big(\tilde{g} \in \tilde{K}[y_1, y_2, \ldots, y_r, y_{r+1}, y_{r+2}] \,\big|\, g(Qz+a) = 0\big)$$

  is principal. Furthermore, $f, g \in \mathfrak{p}$. Since K is algebraically closed in $\tilde{K}$, it follows from lemma 4.5 that $\mathfrak{p} = (f)$. This contradicts $\deg g < \deg f$, so $\operatorname{trdeg}_{\tilde{K}} \tilde{K}(Qz+a) \leq r$ indeed.
- $g = 0$.
  Recall that either $Q_{(r+2)1} = 0$ or $Q_{(r+2)1}$ is linearly independent over K of $Q_{(r+1)1}$ and Q_{11}. In both cases, it follows from lemma 4.4 that

  $$\frac{\partial}{\partial y_1} f = \frac{\partial}{\partial y_{r+1}} f = 0$$

  So $f \in K[y_2, y_3, \ldots, y_r, y_{r+2}]$. As $z_1, z_2, z_3, \ldots, z_r$ are algebraically independent over K, we see that $(Qz+a)_{r+2}$ is algebraically dependent over K of $z_1, z_2, z_3, \ldots, z_r$. From (iii), it follows that $Qe_{r+2} \in K^r$ and $a_{r+2} \in K$.
  We can interchange row $r+2$ of Q with any other row after row $r+1$. If we can do this in such a way that $g \neq 0$ after it, then (iv) follows from the case above. Otherwise, we can conclude that $Q_i \in \operatorname{Mat}_{1,r}(K)$ and $a_i \in K$ for all $i \neq r+1$. So if we take $p^{(1)} = e_{r+1}$ and $b^{(1)} = \big((Q|a)_{r+1}\big)^{\mathrm{t}}$, then $b^{(1)} \notin K^r$ and $(Q|a) - p^{(1)}\big(b^{(1)}\big)^{\mathrm{t}} \in \operatorname{Mat}_{n,r+1}(K)$, which gives (iv) as well. □

Proof of (iii) *of theorem 7.2.* We first show that $\operatorname{trdeg}_L L(H) \leq 1$. So assume that $\operatorname{trdeg}_L L(H) \geq 2$. From (i) and (ii) of lemma 6.1, we deduce that $\operatorname{trdeg}_L L(H) \geq 3$ if H does not have a projective image apex $p \in L^m$ over L. Since

$$\operatorname{trdeg}_L L(H) \leq \operatorname{trdeg}_K K(H) = 2$$

we conclude that H does have a projective image apex over L. From (i) of theorem 4.9, it follows that $\operatorname{trdeg}_L L(H) \leq \operatorname{trdeg}_K K(H) - 1 = 1$.

So $\operatorname{trdeg}_L L(H) \leq 1$ indeed. Suppose that R is a gcd-domain. On account of (ii) of theorem 6.2, h is of the form

$$h = g(p_1x_1 + p_2x_2 + \cdots + p_mx_m) + b_1x_1 + b_2x_2 + \cdots + b_mx_m$$

where $g \in R[t]$ and $b \in R^m$ is any image apex of H over L which is contained in R^m. Furthermore, $p \in R^m$ and

$$f(H) = 0 \Longleftrightarrow f\big(tp + (1-u)H + ub\big) = 0 \Longleftrightarrow f(tp+b) = 0$$

for every $f \in L[y]$. So if $p \neq 0$, then p is a projective image apex of H over L. From (iv) of theorem 3.6, it follows that $p \notin R \cdot K^m$ if $p \neq 0$.

If a is an image apex of H over L, then we can take $b = a$, so

$$f(H) = 0 \Longleftrightarrow f(tp+a) = 0$$

for every $f \in K[y]$. Suppose next that a is not an image apex of H over L. From (iii) of theorem 4.9, it follows that $\operatorname{trdeg}_L L(H) \leq \operatorname{trdeg}_K K(H) - 2 = 0$. On account of (i) of theorem 6.2, h is of the form

$$h = g + b_1x_1 + b_2x_2 + \cdots + b_mx_m$$

where $g \in R$ and $b \in R^m$. So if we define $p = b - a$, then

$$h = g + p_1x_1 + p_2x_2 + \cdots + p_mx_m + a_1x_1 + a_2x_2 + \cdots + a_mx_m$$

and $H = p + a$. Since $tH + (1-t)a = t(H-a) + a = tp + a$, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} f(H) = 0 &\Longrightarrow f\big((1-t)H + ta\big) = 0 \\ &\Longrightarrow f\big(tH + (1-t)a\big) = 0 \Longrightarrow f(tp+a) = 0 \end{aligned}$$

for every $f \in K[y]$. The converse follows from $H = p + a$, so

$$f(H) = 0 \Longleftrightarrow f(tp+a) = 0$$

for every $f \in K[y]$, regardless of whether a is an image apex of H over L or not.

Since $\operatorname{trdeg}_K K(a) = 0 < 1 = \operatorname{trdeg}_K K(H)$ we see that $p \neq 0$. From (ii) of lemma 7.4, it follows that there exists an $\alpha \in L$ such that $\operatorname{trdeg}_K K(\alpha^{-1}p) \leq \operatorname{trdeg}_K K(H) - 1 = 1$. So there exists a $\gamma \in L$ such that $\operatorname{trdeg}_{K(\gamma)} K(\gamma)(\alpha^{-1}p) = 0$. As $p \neq 0$, we conclude that

$$\operatorname{trdeg}_{K(\gamma)} K(\gamma)(tp) = 1$$

which completes the proof of (iii) of theorem 7.2. □

Proof of (iv) *of theorem 7.2.* Just as in the proof of (iii) of theorem 7.2, we can deduce that h is of the given form, and that $f(H) = 0 \Longleftrightarrow f(tp+b) = 0$ for every $f \in L[y]$. Furthermore, $p \notin R \cdot K^m$ if $p \neq 0$.

Since $f(H) = 0 \Longleftrightarrow f(tp+b) = 0$ for every $f \in K[y]$, it follows that

$$\operatorname{trdeg}_K K(tp+b) = \operatorname{trdeg}_K K(H) = 2$$

If $p = 0$, then $\operatorname{trdeg}_K K(b) = 2$ and we take for γ any element of $K(b) \setminus K$, so

$$\operatorname{trdeg}_{K(\gamma)} K(\gamma)(tp) = 0 \qquad\qquad \operatorname{trdeg}_{K(\gamma)} K(\gamma)(b - \lambda) = 1$$

for every $\lambda \in L$. Hence assume from now on that $p \neq 0$.

Since $p \neq 0$ and $\operatorname{trdeg}_K K(tp+b) = 2$, it follows from (iv) of lemma 7.4 that there are $\alpha, \lambda \in L$ such that one of the following is satisfied.

- $\alpha^{-1}p, b - \lambda p \in \tilde{K}^m$ *for an extension field* $\tilde{K}$ *of* K *for which* $\operatorname{trdeg}_K \tilde{K} = 1$ *and* $\tilde{K} \subseteq L$.

  Take any $\gamma \in \tilde{K} \setminus K$. Since $\gamma \in \tilde{K} \setminus K \subseteq L \setminus K$ and K is algebraically closed in L, it follows that γ is a transcendence basis of $\tilde{K}$ over K. Consequently, $\operatorname{trdeg}_{K(\gamma)} K(\gamma)(\alpha^{-1}p) = 0$ and $\operatorname{trdeg}_{K(\gamma)} K(\gamma)(b - \lambda p) = 0$. As $p \neq 0$, we conclude that

  $$\operatorname{trdeg}_{K(\gamma)} K(\gamma)(tp) = 1 \qquad \operatorname{trdeg}_{K(\gamma)} K(\gamma)(b - \lambda p) = 0$$

- *There are* $p^{(1)} \in K^m$, $b^{(1)} \in L^2 \setminus K^2$, *such that* $\alpha^{-1}p - b_1^{(1)}p^{(1)} \in K^m$ *and* $b - \lambda p - b_2^{(1)}p^{(1)} \in K^m$.

  We prove that this case cannot occur, by showing that $p^{(1)}$ is a projective image apex of H over K. Take

  $$\psi(t) := \alpha \cdot (t + \lambda) \cdot b_1^{(1)} + b_2^{(1)}$$

  Then $\psi(\alpha^{-1}t - \lambda) = tb_1^{(1)} + b_2^{(1)}$ and

  $$\begin{aligned}
  &\operatorname{trdeg}_K K\big(tp + b + up^{(1)}\big) \\
  &\quad = \operatorname{trdeg}_K K\big(tp + b + (u - \psi(t))p^{(1)}\big) \\
  &\quad \leq \operatorname{trdeg}_K K\big(tp + b - \psi(t)p^{(1)}, up^{(1)}\big) \\
  &\quad = \operatorname{trdeg}_K K\big((\alpha^{-1}t - \lambda)p + b - \psi(\alpha^{-1}t - \lambda)p^{(1)}, up^{(1)}\big) \\
  &\quad = \operatorname{trdeg}_K K\big(t\alpha^{-1}p - \lambda p + b - tb_1^{(1)}p^{(1)} - b_2^{(1)}p^{(1)}, up^{(1)}\big) \\
  &\quad = \operatorname{trdeg}_K K\big(t(\alpha^{-1}p - b_1^{(1)}p^{(1)}) + (b - \lambda p - b_2^{(1)}p^{(1)}), up^{(1)}\big) \\
  &\quad \leq \operatorname{trdeg}_K K\big(t(\alpha^{-1}p - b_1^{(1)}p^{(1)})\big) + \\
  &\qquad \operatorname{trdeg}_K K\big((b - \lambda p) - b_2^{(1)}p^{(1)}\big) + \operatorname{trdeg}_K K(up^{(1)}) \\
  &\quad = 1 + 0 + 1 = 2 \\
  &\quad = \operatorname{trdeg}_K K(tp + b)
  \end{aligned}$$

  Since $tp + b$ is obtained from $tp + b + up^{(1)}$ by substituting $u = 0$ in addition, it follows that $p^{(1)}$ is a projective image apex over K of $tp + b$. From $f(H) = 0 \Longleftrightarrow f(tp + b) = 0$ for every $f \in K[y]$ and proposition 3.3, we deduce that $p^{(1)}$ is a projective image apex of H over K. □

If R is a polynomial ring and $\lambda = 0$ in (iv) of theorem 7.2, then one can show that there exists a $\gamma \in R$ such that $b \in K[\gamma]^m$ and $p \in R \cdot K[\gamma]^m$.

But λ in (iv) of theorem 7.2 does not need to be zero. Take for instance $R = K[x_4, x_5]$, $g = t^2$, $\gamma = (x_4x_5 + 1)/x_5$,

$$p := \begin{pmatrix} -x_5^3 \\ (x_4x_5 + 1)^3 \\ (x_4x_5 + 1)^2x_5 \end{pmatrix} \qquad \text{and} \qquad b := \begin{pmatrix} (-x_4x_5 + 1)x_5 \\ x_4^2(x_4x_5 + 1)^2 \\ x_4^2(x_4x_5 + 1)x_5 \end{pmatrix}$$

Then $\operatorname{trdeg}_K K(b) = 2$, so $\lambda \neq 0$. One can verify that

$$p = x_5^3 \begin{pmatrix} -1 \\ \gamma^3 \\ \gamma^2 \end{pmatrix} \qquad \text{and} \qquad b - \frac{x_4^2}{x_4x_5 + 1}p = \begin{pmatrix} \gamma^{-1} \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

so $\lambda = x_4^2/(x_4x_5 + 1)$ is possible.

Proof of the case where R is a Bézout domain of (v) *of theorem 7.2.* We first show that $\operatorname{trdeg}_L L(H) \leq 2$. So assume that $\operatorname{trdeg}_L L(H) \geq 3$. From (ii) of theorem 4.9, it follows that a is an image apex of H over L as well. Since

$$3 \leq \operatorname{trdeg}_L L(H) \leq \operatorname{trdeg}_K K(H) = 3$$

we deduce from (ii) of lemma 6.1 that H has a projective image apex $p \in L^m$ over L. This contradicts (i) of theorem 4.9, so $\operatorname{trdeg}_L L(H) \leq 2$ indeed.

Suppose that R is a Bézout domain. We show that H has an image apex $b \in R^m$ over L. If $\operatorname{trdeg}_L L(H) \leq 1$, then H has an image apex $b \in R^m$ over L on account of (ii) of theorem 6.2, so assume that $\operatorname{trdeg}_L L(H) = 2$. Then it follows from (i) of lemma 6.1 that H has a projective image apex $p \in L^m$ over L. On account of (iii) of theorem 4.9, a is an image apex of H over L.

So $\operatorname{trdeg}_L L(H) \leq 2$ and H has an image apex $b \in R^m$ over L. On account of (iii) of theorem 6.2, h is of the form

$$h = g(p_1x_1 + p_2x_2 + \cdots + p_mx_m, q_1x_1 + q_2x_2 + \cdots + q_mx_m) + b_1x_1 + b_2x_2 + \cdots + b_mx_m$$

where $g \in R[t, u]$. Furthermore, $p, q \in R^m$, such that

$$f(H) = 0 \Longleftrightarrow f\big(tp + uq + (1 - v)H + vb\big) = 0 \Longleftrightarrow f(tp + uq + vb) = 0$$

for every $f \in L[y]$, where v is a variable.

It follows that every L-linear combination of p and q, which is not the zero vector, is a projective image apex of H over L. Furthermore, we can take $q = 0$ if p and q are dependent over L. From (iv) of theorem 3.6, we deduce that $q = 0$ if some nontrivial L-linear combination of p and q is contained in K^m.

If a is an image apex of H over L, then we can take $b = a$, so

$$f(H) = 0 \Longleftrightarrow f(tp + uq + a) = 0$$

for every $f \in K[y]$. Suppose next that a is not an image apex of H over L. From (iii) of theorem 4.9, it follows that $\operatorname{trdeg}_L L(H) \leq \operatorname{trdeg}_K K(H) - 2 = 1$. On account of (ii) of theorem 6.2, h is of the form

$$h = g(p_1x_1 + p_2x_2 + \cdots + p_mx_m) + b_1x_1 + b_2x_2 + \cdots + b_mx_m$$

where $g \in R[t]$ and $b \in R^m$. Furthermore, $f(H) = 0 \Longleftrightarrow f(tp+b) = 0$ for every $f \in L[y]$. From proposition 3.3, it follows that

$$f(H) = 0 \Longleftrightarrow f\big((1 - u)(tp + b) + ua\big) = 0$$

If we substitute $t = t/(1-u)$, then we obtain

$$f(H) = 0 \Longleftrightarrow f\big(tp + (1-u)b + ua\big) = 0$$

So if we define $q = b - a$, then

$$h = g(p_1x_1 + p_2x_2 + \cdots + p_mx_m) + q_1x_1 + q_2x_2 + \cdots + q_mx_m + a_1x_1 + a_2x_2 + \cdots + a_mx_m$$

and, since $(1-u)b + ua = (1-u)q + a$,

$$f(H) = 0 \Longleftrightarrow f\big(tp + (1-u)q + a\big) = 0 \Longleftrightarrow f(tp + uq + a) = 0$$

for every $f \in K[y]$. Consequently,

$$f(H) = 0 \Longleftrightarrow f(tp + uq + a) = 0$$

for every $f \in K[y]$, regardless of whether a is an image apex of H over L or not. □

Proof of the case where $R = L$ of (v) *of theorem 7.2.* As L is a Bézout domain, it suffices to prove that $\operatorname{trdeg}_{K(\gamma)} K(\gamma)(tp) + \operatorname{trdeg}_{K(\gamma)} K(\gamma)(uq) = 2$ for some $\gamma \in L$.

Since $f(H) = 0 \Longleftrightarrow f(tp + uq + a) = 0$ for every $f \in K[y]$ if R is a Bézout domain, it follows that

$$\operatorname{trdeg}_K K(tp + uq) = \operatorname{trdeg}_K K(H) = 3$$

If $q = 0$, then $\operatorname{trdeg}_K K(tp) = 3$ and we take for γ any element of $K(p) \setminus K$, so

$$\operatorname{trdeg}_{K(\gamma)} K(\gamma)(tp) = 2 \qquad \operatorname{trdeg}_{K(\gamma)} K(\gamma)(uq) = 0$$

Hence assume from now on that $q \neq 0$.

Suppose that $R = L$. Since p and q are independent over L and $\operatorname{trdeg}_K K(tp + uq) = 3$, it follows from (iv) of lemma 7.4 that we may assume that one of the following is satisfied.

- *$p, q \in \tilde{K}^m$ for an extension field $\tilde{K}$ of K for which $\operatorname{trdeg}_K \tilde{K} = 1$ and $\tilde{K} \subseteq L$.*

  Take any $\gamma \in \tilde{K} \setminus K$. Since $\gamma \in \tilde{K} \setminus K \subseteq L \setminus K$ and K is algebraically closed in L, it follows that γ is a transcendence basis of $\tilde{K}$ over K. Consequently, $\operatorname{trdeg}_{K(\gamma)} K(\gamma)(p) = 0$ and $\operatorname{trdeg}_{K(\gamma)} K(\gamma)(q) = 0$. As $p, q \neq 0$, we conclude that

  $$\operatorname{trdeg}_{K(\gamma)} K(\gamma)(tp) = 1 \qquad \operatorname{trdeg}_{K(\gamma)} K(\gamma)(uq) = 1$$

- *There are $p^{(1)} \in K^m$, $b^{(1)} \in L^2 \setminus K^2$, such that $p - b_1^{(1)}p^{(1)} \in K^m$ and $q - b_2^{(1)}p^{(1)} \in K^m$.*

We prove that this case cannot occur, by showing that $p^{(1)}$ is a projective image apex of H over K. Let v be a variable. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
&\operatorname{trdeg}_K K\big(tp+uq+a+vp^{(1)}\big)\\
&\quad=\operatorname{trdeg}_K K\big(tp+uq+(v-b_1^{(1)}t-b_2^{(1)}u)p^{(1)}\big)\\
&\quad\le\operatorname{trdeg}_K K\big(t(p-b_1^{(1)}p^{(1)})+u(q-b_2^{(1)}p^{(1)})+vp^{(1)}\big)\\
&\quad\le\operatorname{trdeg}_K K\big(t(p-b_1^{(1)}p^{(1)})\big)+\\
&\qquad\operatorname{trdeg}_K K\big(u(q-b_2^{(1)}p^{(1)})\big)+\operatorname{trdeg}_K K\big(vp^{(1)}\big)\\
&\quad=1+1+1=3\\
&\quad=\operatorname{trdeg}_K K(tp+uq+a)
\end{aligned}$$

Since $tp+uq+a$ is obtained from $tp+uq+a+vp^{(1)}$ by substituting $v=0$ in addition, it follows that $p^{(1)}$ is a projective image apex over K of $tp+uq+a$. From $f(H)=0\Longleftrightarrow f(tp+uq+a)=0$ for every $f\in K[y]$ and proposition 3.3, we deduce that $p^{(1)}$ is a projective image apex of H over K. □

Proof of the case where L satisfies Lüroth's theorem as an extension field of K of (v) *of theorem 7.2.* We reduce to the case $R=L$. So assume that $g\in L[t,u]$ and $p,q\in L^m$ satisfy (v) of theorem 7.2 for $R=L$. If $q=0$, then it follows from (ii) of lemma 6.3 that we can choose $g\in R[t]$ and $p\in R^m$. So assume from now on that $q\neq 0$.

Since $p\neq 0$ as well, and $\operatorname{trdeg}_{K(\gamma)} K(\gamma)(tp)+\operatorname{trdeg}_{K(\gamma)} K(\gamma)(uq)=2$, we deduce that

$$\operatorname{trdeg}_{K(\gamma)} K(\gamma)(tp)=\operatorname{trdeg}_{K(\gamma)} K(\gamma)(uq)=1$$

Now replace p by λp for some $\lambda\in L$, to obtain $p_i\in K(\gamma)\setminus\{0\}$ for some i. Then t is algebraic over $K(\gamma)(p+tp)$, so p is not a projective image apex over $K(\gamma)$ of p on account of (ii) of proposition 3.2. Furthermore,

$$\operatorname{trdeg}_{K(\gamma)} K(\gamma)(p)\neq\operatorname{trdeg}_{K(\gamma)} K(\gamma)(p+tp)=1$$

so $\operatorname{trdeg}_{K(\gamma)} K(\gamma)(p)=0$. Similarly, we may assume that $\operatorname{trdeg}_{K(\gamma)} K(\gamma)(q)=0$.

Consequently, $\operatorname{trdeg}_K K(p,q)=\operatorname{trdeg}_K K(\gamma)=1$. Since L satisfies Lüroth's theorem as an extension field of K, we can choose $\gamma\in L$ such that $p,q\in K(\gamma)^m$. Now multiply p by an element of $K[\gamma]$, to obtain that $p\in K[\gamma]^m$. Similarly, we may assume that $q\in K[\gamma]^m$.

Notice that $\gamma\notin K$. Since K is algebraically closed in L, we can view γ as a variable over K. From lemma 6.4, it follows that we may assume that $(p|q)$ is left invertible over $K[\gamma]$. From (ii) of corollary 6.5, it follows that we may assume that the coefficient vector $\hat{p}\in K^m$ of $\gamma^{\deg_\gamma p}$ of p and the coefficient vector $\hat{q}\in K^m$ of $\gamma^{\deg_\gamma q}$ of q are independent vectors.

Since R is a gcd-ring, we can write $\gamma=c_1/c_2$, where $c_1,c_2\in R$ such that $\gcd\{c_1,c_2\}=1$. Define

$$\tilde{p}:=c_2^{\deg_\gamma p}p\qquad\text{and}\qquad\tilde{q}:=c_2^{\deg_\gamma q}q\qquad\text{and}$$

Then $\tilde{p}, \tilde{q} \in R^m$ and

$$h = \tilde{g}(\tilde{p}_1 x_1 + \tilde{p}_2 x_2 + \cdots + \tilde{p}_m x_m, \tilde{q}_1 x_1 + \tilde{q}_2 x_2 + \cdots + \tilde{q}_m x_m) + a_1 x_1 + a_2 x_2 + \cdots + a_m x_m$$

for some $\tilde{g} \in L[t, u]$. We shall show that $\tilde{g} \in R[t, u]$.

Let $C \in \mathrm{Mat}_{2,m}(K[\gamma]) \subseteq \mathrm{Mat}_{2,m}(R[c_2^{-1}])$ be a left inverse of $(p|q)$. Then

$$C \cdot (\tilde{p}|\tilde{q}) = \begin{pmatrix} c_2^{\deg_\gamma p} & 0 \\ 0 & c_2^{\deg_\gamma q} \end{pmatrix}$$

so

$$h\big(C^{\mathrm{t}}\tbinom{t}{u}\big) = \tilde{g}\Big(c_2^{\deg_\gamma p} t, c_2^{\deg_\gamma q} u\Big) + a^{\mathrm{t}} C^{\mathrm{t}} \tbinom{t}{u}$$

Since c_2 is a unit in $R[c_2^{-1}]$ and $a^{\mathrm{t}} C^{\mathrm{t}} \in R[c_2^{-1}]^2$, we deduce that $\tilde{g} \in R[c_2^{-1}][t, u]$.

Since $\hat{p} \in K^m$ and $\hat{q} \in K^m$ are independent, there exists a $\hat{C} \in \mathrm{Mat}_{2,m}(K)$ which is a left inverse of $(\hat{p}|\hat{q})$. Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{C} \cdot (\tilde{p}|\tilde{q}) &\equiv \begin{pmatrix} (\gamma c_2)^{\deg_\gamma p} & 0 \\ 0 & (\gamma c_2)^{\deg_\gamma q} \end{pmatrix} \pmod{c_2} \\ &\equiv \begin{pmatrix} c_1^{\deg_\gamma p} & 0 \\ 0 & c_1^{\deg_\gamma q} \end{pmatrix} \pmod{c_2} \end{aligned}$$

so

$$h\big(\hat{C}^{\mathrm{t}}\tbinom{t}{u}\big) \equiv \tilde{g}\Big(c_1^{\deg_\gamma p} t, c_1^{\deg_\gamma q} u\Big) + a^{\mathrm{t}} \hat{C}^{\mathrm{t}} \tbinom{t}{u} \pmod{c_2}$$

It follows that $\tilde{g}$ does not have coefficients which are contained in $R[c_2^{-1}] \setminus R$. So $\tilde{g} \in R[t, u]$. □

Proof of the last claim of theorem 7.2. Suppose that h is of the form of (ii) of theorem 7.2 and $\deg b < 2$. Then $\deg b = 1$, because $b \notin K^m$. So there exists an i such that the vector $p^{(1)} \in K^m$ of coefficients of x_i in $H = b$ is nonzero. By substituting $x_i = x_i + t$ in H, we see that $p^{(1)}$ is a projective image apex of H over K. Contradiction, so $\deg b \geq 2$ if h is of the form of (ii) of theorem 7.2.

Suppose that h is of the form of (iii) of theorem 7.2 and $\deg p < 2$. Then $\deg p = 1$, because $p \notin K^m$. So there exists an i such that the vector $p^{(1)} \in K^m$ of coefficients of x_i in p is nonzero. By substituting $x_i = x_i + u/t$ in $tp + a$, we see that $p^{(1)}$ is a projective image apex of $tp + a$. By way of proposition 3.3, it follows from the last claim in (iii) of theorem 7.2 that $p^{(1)}$ is a projective image apex of H over K. Contradiction, so $\deg p \geq 2$ if h is of the form of (iii) of theorem 7.2. □

8 Theorem 5.4 for gradient maps

Proof of (iii) *of theorem 5.4.* The case where $\mathrm{rk}\, \mathcal{J}H \leq 2$ follows from (i), so assume that $\mathrm{rk}\, \mathcal{J}H = 3$.

Just like for M in the proof of proposition 5.3 and N in the proof of (i) and (ii) of theorem 5.4, theorem 5.1 allows us to assume that $N = \operatorname{rk} \mathcal{J}H + 2 = 5$. Take k and k' as in the proofs of proposition 5.3 and (i) and (ii) of theorem 5.4. The case $k' = s + 1$ follows in a similar manner as in the proofs of proposition 5.3 and (i) and (ii) of theorem 5.4.

So assume that $k' \geq s + 2$. The case $k \leq k'$ follows in a similar manner as in the proofs of (i) of proposition 5.3 and (i) of theorem 5.4. So assume that $k \geq k' + 1 \geq s + 3$. From the minimality of k, it follows that $k - s \leq N - k'$, so $k + k' \leq N + s = s + 5$. If we combine this with $k \geq s + 3$ and $k' \geq s + 2$, then we see that $s = 0$, $k = 3$ and $k' = 2$.

Let $R = K[x_4, x_5]$ and $\tilde{R} = K[x_1, x_2]$. From (iii) and (iv) of theorem 7.2, it follows that $H = \nabla \tilde{h}$ for some $\tilde{h} \in K[X]$, such that

$$\tilde{h} = g(p_1 x_1 + p_2 x_2 + p_3 x_3) + b_1 x_1 + b_2 x_2 + b_3 x_3$$

where $g \in R[t]$ and $p_i, b_i \in R$ for all i, and

$$\tilde{h} = \tilde{g}(\tilde{p}_3 x_3 + \tilde{p}_4 x_4 + \tilde{p}_5 x_5) + \tilde{b}_3 x_3 + \tilde{b}_4 x_4 + \tilde{b}_5 x_5$$

where $\tilde{g} \in \tilde{R}[t]$ and $\tilde{p}_i, \tilde{b}_i \in \tilde{R}$ for all i.

We first show that we may assume that p_2 and p_3 do not have a constant term. Let $v := \big(p_1(0,0), p_2(0,0), p_3(0,0)\big)$ and assume that $v \neq 0$. Then there exists a $T \in \mathrm{GL}_3(K)$ such that $v^{\mathrm{t}} T = (1\ 0\ 0)$. Now replace H by $\tilde{T}^{\mathrm{t}} H(\tilde{T}X)$ and $\tilde{h}$ by $\tilde{h}(\tilde{T}X)$, where

$$\tilde{T} = \begin{pmatrix} & & & 0 & 0 \\ & T & & 0 & 0 \\ & & & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

Then v becomes $(1, 0, 0)$, so p_2 and p_3 do not have a constant term any more. The property that $(H_3, H_4, H_5) = (H_{k'+1}, H_{k'+2}, H_{k'+3})$ does not have an image apex may be affected, but restoring that as in the proofs of proposition 5.3 and (i) and (ii) of theorem 5.4 will not affect $v = (1, 0, 0)$.

So $p_3 \notin K^*$. We distinguish two cases.

- $\deg_{x_3} \tilde{h} \leq 1$.
  Then the coefficient of x_3^1 is contained $R \cap \tilde{R} = K$, so $H_3 \in K$. We will derive a contradiction by showing that H_2, H_3, H_4 are algebraically independent over K. From the proof of proposition 5.3, it follows that H_1 and H_5 are algebraically dependent over K of H_2, H_3, H_4. Since $r = 3$, we deduce that H_2, H_3, H_4 is a transcendence basis over K of $K(H)$.

- $\deg_{x_3} \tilde{h} \geq 2$.
  Then the leading coefficient with respect to x_3 of $\tilde{h}$ is contained in R, but not in K, because it is divisible by $p_3 \notin K$. On the other hand, the leading coefficient with respect to x_3 of $\tilde{h}$ is contained in $\tilde{R}$. This contradicts $(R \setminus K) \cap \tilde{R} = \varnothing$. □

Proof of (iv) *of theorem 5.4.* The case where $\operatorname{rk} \mathcal{J}H \leq s+2$ follows from (i), so assume that $\operatorname{rk} \mathcal{J}H = s+3$.

Just like for M in the proof of proposition 5.3 and N in the proof of (i) and (ii) of theorem 5.4, theorem 5.1 allows us to assume that $N = \operatorname{rk} \mathcal{J}H + 2 = 6$. Take k and k' as in the proofs of proposition 5.3 and (i) and (ii) of theorem 5.4. The case $k' = s+1 = 1$ follows in a similar manner as in the proofs of proposition 5.3 and (i) and (ii) of theorem 5.4.

So assume that $k' \geq s+2$. The case $k \leq k'+1$ follows in a similar manner as in the proofs of (ii) of proposition 5.3 and (ii) of theorem 5.4. So assume that $k \geq k'+2 \geq s+4$. From the minimality of k, it follows that $k - s \leq N - k'$, so $k + k' \leq N + s = s + 6$. If we combine this with $k \geq s+4$ and $k' \geq s+2$, then we see that $s = 0$, $k = 4$ and $k' = 2$.

Let $R = K[x_5, x_6]$, $L = K(x_5, x_6)$, $\tilde{R} = K[x_1, x_2]$ and $\tilde{L} = K(x_1, x_2)$. Supppose that $a \in K^6$ is an image apex of H. From (v) of theorem 7.2, it follows that $H = \nabla \tilde{h} + a$ for some $\tilde{h} \in K[X]$, such that

$$\tilde{h} = g(p_1x_1 + p_2x_2 + p_3x_3 + p_4x_4, q_1x_1 + q_2x_2 + q_3x_3 + q_4x_4)$$

where $g \in L[t, u]$ and $p_i, q_i \in R$ for all i, and

$$\tilde{h} = \tilde{g}(\tilde{p}_3x_3 + \tilde{p}_4x_4 + \tilde{p}_5x_5 + \tilde{p}_6x_6, \tilde{q}_3x_3 + \tilde{q}_4x_4 + \tilde{q}_5x_5 + \tilde{q}_6x_6)$$

where $\tilde{g} \in \tilde{L}[u]$ and $\tilde{p}_i, \tilde{q}_i \in \tilde{R}$ for all i.

Let $(c_1, c_2, c_3, c_4) \in R^4$ be an L-linear combination of (p_1, p_2, p_3, p_4) and (q_1, q_2, q_3, q_4), such that its constant part $v := \big(c_1(0,0), c_2(0,0), c_3(0,0), c_4(0,0)\big) \neq 0$ in the case where it is possible to take (c_1, c_2, c_3, c_4) as such. Just like for the assumption that $v = (1,0,0)$ if $v \neq 0$ in the proof of (iii) of theorem 5.4, we may assume in this proof that $v = (1,0,0,0)$ if $v \neq 0$.

From the proof of proposition 5.3, it follows that H_1 and H_6 are algebraically dependent over K of H_2, H_3, H_4, H_5. Since $r = 4$, we deduce that H_2, H_3, H_4, H_5 is a transcendence basis over K of $K(H)$. So $H_3 - a_3$ and $H_4 - a_4$ are linearly independent over K.

Assume without loss of generality that $q_3 = 0$ and $\tilde{q}_3 = 0$. Then $p_3\tilde{p}_3 \neq 0$, because $H_3 - a_3 \neq 0$. We distinguish three cases.

- $q_4 = 0$.
  From $q_3 = q_4 = 0$, it follows that

  $$p_4(H_3 - a_3) - p_3(H_4 - a_4) = 0$$

  Since $H_3 - a_3$ and $H_4 - a_4$ are linearly independent over K, it follows that $p_4 \neq 0$ and $p_4^{-1}p_3 \notin K$.

  From $q_3 = q_4 = 0$, it follows that

  $$j := \deg_t g = \deg_{x_3} \tilde{h} = \deg_{x_4} \tilde{h}$$

  Let

  $$\tilde{c}_3 := \frac{\partial^j}{\partial x_3^j}\tilde{h} \qquad \text{and} \qquad \tilde{c}_4 := \frac{\partial^j}{\partial x_4^j}\tilde{h}$$

Then

$$\tilde{c}_3, \tilde{c}_4 \in K[x_1, x_2, x_5, x_6] = \tilde{R}[x_5, x_6] \qquad \text{and} \qquad \tilde{c}_3 = p_4^{-j} p_3^j \tilde{c}_4$$

Since $p_4^{-j} p_3^j \in L \setminus K$, it follows that either $\tilde{c}_3 \notin K$ or $\tilde{c}_4 \notin K$, say that $\tilde{c}_3 \notin K$.

Notice that on one hand $\tilde{c}_3 \in L \setminus K = L \setminus \tilde{L}$, and on the other hand, $\tilde{c}_3 \in \tilde{L}[x_5, x_6]$. So $\tilde{c}_3 \in \tilde{L}[x_5, x_6] \setminus \tilde{L}$. Since additionally

$$\tilde{c}_3 \in \tilde{L}[\tilde{p}_3 x_3 + \tilde{p}_4 x_4 + \tilde{p}_5 x_5 + \tilde{p}_6 x_6, \tilde{q}_3 x_3 + \tilde{q}_4 x_4 + \tilde{q}_5 x_5 + \tilde{q}_6 x_6]$$

it follows that $\tilde{q}_4 = 0$ along with $\tilde{q}_3 = 0$. Furthermore, $\tilde{c}_3 \in \tilde{L}[\tilde{q}_5 x_5 + \tilde{q}_6 x_6]$ and

$$\tilde{p}_4(H_3 - a_3) - \tilde{p}_3(H_4 - a_4) = 0 = p_4(H_3 - a_3) - p_3(H_4 - a_4)$$

So $p_4^{-1} p_3 = \tilde{p}_4^{-1} \tilde{p}_3 \in L \cap \tilde{L} = K$. Contradiction.

- $q_4 \in K^*$.
  From (iv) of lemma 6.3, it follows that we may assume that $p_4 = 0$ and $g \in R[t, u]$.

  Suppose first that $p_3 \in K$. Notice that $v \neq 0$ was possible, so $v = (1, 0, 0, 0)$. Since $q_3 = 0 = p_4$ and $p_3 q_4 \neq 0$, it follows that $c_i = c_3 p_3^{-1} p_i + c_4 q_4^{-1} q_i$ for all i. As $p_3 \in K^*$ and $q_4 \in K^*$, this contradicts that $c_1(0) = v_1 \neq 0$.

  Suppose next that $p_3 \notin K$. From $q_3 = 0 \neq H_3 - a_3$, it follows that

  $$j := \deg_t g = \deg_{x_3} \tilde{h} \geq 1$$

  Let

  $$\tilde{c}_3 := \frac{\partial^j}{\partial x_3^j} \tilde{h}$$

  Since $g \in R[t, u]$, it follows that $p_3 \mid p_3^j \mid \tilde{c}_3$. So $\tilde{c}_3 \notin K$. Just as in the proof of the case $q_4 = 0$ above, we can deduce that $\tilde{q}_4 = 0$ along with $\tilde{q}_3 = 0$. So we can get a contradiction in a similar manner as in the case $q_4 = 0$ above.

- $q_4 \notin K$.
  Let $d := \deg g$. We will show below that there exists a $j \in \{1, 2, \ldots, d\}$, such that either $\tilde{c}_3 \neq 0$ or $\tilde{c}_4 \neq 0$, where

  $$\tilde{c}_i := \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} \frac{\partial^{j-1}}{\partial x_3^{j-1}} \frac{\partial^{d-j}}{\partial x_4^{d-j}} \tilde{h}$$

  for all $i \leq 4$. Since $1 + (j-1) + (d-j) = d$, we see that $\tilde{c}_i \in R$ for all i.

  If the leading homogeneous part of g is contained in $K[u]$, then we take $j = 1$, so

  $$\tilde{c}_4 = \frac{\partial}{\partial x_4} \frac{\partial^{1-1}}{\partial x_3^{1-1}} \frac{\partial^{d-1}}{\partial x_4^{d-1}} \tilde{h} = \frac{\partial^d}{\partial x_4^d} \tilde{h} \neq 0$$

If the leading homogeneous part of g is not contained in $K[u]$, then we take for j its positive degree with respect to t, so

$$\tilde{c}_3 = \frac{\partial^j}{\partial x_3^j} \frac{\partial^{d-j}}{\partial x_4^{d-j}} \tilde{h} \neq 0$$

If $\tilde{c}_3 \notin K$ or $\tilde{c}_4 \notin K$, then we can derive in a similar manner as in the proof of the case $q_4 = 0$ above that $\tilde{q}_4 = 0$ along with $\tilde{q}_3 = 0$. So we can get a contradiction in a similar manner as in the case $q_4 = 0$ above if $\tilde{c}_3 \notin K$ or $\tilde{c}_4 \notin K$.

So assume that $\tilde{c}_3 \in K$ and $\tilde{c}_4 \in K$. Then $\tilde{v} := (\tilde{c}_3, \tilde{c}_4) \in K^2$. Just as we obtained $v = (1, 0, 0, 0)$ above, we can obtain $\tilde{v} = (0, 1)$, because either $\tilde{c}_3 \neq 0$ or $\tilde{c}_4 \neq 0$. Since

$$\frac{\partial^{j-1}}{\partial x_3^{j-1}} \frac{\partial^{d-j}}{\partial x_4^{d-j}} \tilde{h} = \tilde{c}_1 x_1 + \tilde{c}_2 x_2 + \tilde{c}_3 x_3 + \tilde{c}_4 x_4$$

is an L-linear combination of $p_1x_1 + p_2x_2 + p_3x_3 + p_4x_4$ and $q_1x_1 + q_2x_2 + q_3x_3 + q_4x_4$, we can replace q_i by $\tilde{c}_i$ for all i, to obtain the case $q_4 \in K^*$ above. □

References

[dB1] Michiel de Bondt. *Homogeneous Keller maps*. PhD thesis, University of Nijmegen, Toernooiveld, 6525 ED Nijmegen, The Netherlands, July 7 2009. Directed by A.R.P. van den Essen.

[dB2] Michiel de Bondt. Homogeneous quasi-translations in dimension 5. arXiv:1501.04845, 2015.

[dB3] Michiel de Bondt. Quasi-translations and singular hessians. arXiv:1501.05168, 2015.

[vdE] Arno van den Essen. *Polynomial automorphisms and the Jacobian conjecture*, volume 190 of *Progress in Mathematics*. Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel, 2000.

[GZ] Gianluca Gorni and Gaetano Zampieri. On cubic-linear polynomial mappings. *Indag. Math. (N.S.)*, 8(4):471–492, 1997.

[Kap] Irving Kaplansky. Elementary divisors and modules. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 66:464–491, 1949.

[Smi] Henry J. Stephen Smith. On systems of linear indeterminate equations and congruences. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London*, 151:pp. 293–326, 1861.